THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. V DECEMBER, 1922 No. 30

EDITORIAL

This number closes the fifth volume of Theology, and we are glad to say that the increase in circulation since July, when the price was lowered, justifies us in returning to our original size of sixty-four pages. This will be continued at any rate until March as an experiment, and we hope that a still further accession of readers will enable us to continue it permanently. Twice in recent months the Journal has been out of print within two or three weeks of publication; and we therefore urge that, where possible, firm orders for a year should be given, so that intending readers may be sure of getting it. It is an encouraging fact that the number of annual subscribers has increased in each month since the magazine started. These annual subscriptions are of special benefit to the Journal, as they enable us to look ahead and to plan enrichments and developments which should add to its usefulness. Orders may be lodged with any bookseller.

The past year has seen two great writers removed by death from the world of theological study and literature. Neither of them belonged to the Church of England, but both were well known within our borders. Principal Forsyth was the most forcible exponent of the pure tradition of Evangelicalism in our day; the centrality of the Cross as the supreme act of God and the creative source of the Church's and of the individual's righteousness was his theme; and his swift, staccato style imported a prophetic fervour into the most abstruse problems of dogmatic theology. Very different was the contribution of Dr. Hastings, whose great series of dictionaries marked him out as pre-eminently an accumulator and distributer of knowledge. Few men can have produced so many standard works

of reference as he. And yet he combined this with popular gifts of writing which were the delight of all readers of the *Expository Times;* and we extend to our contemporary our warm sympathy in their loss.

The past year has witnessed also the suspension of a well-known theological review, the *Constructive Quarterly*, owing to the continued serious illness of its editor, Mr. Silas McBee. That review had done a very valuable work as a focus of the centripetal forces in modern religious thought, and its place will be hard to fill. It served as a useful handmaid to the World Conference on Faith and Order, which is to meet at Washington in 1925.

Another journalistic change has been in the proprietorship and direction of the *Guardian*. Already we note indication of new minds and methods at work in regard both to political and to ecclesiastical questions. We wish the enterprise every success.

Last month the series of nine Anglo-Catholic Congresses held in various provincial centres was brought to a close with the Congress at Plymouth. These keen and crowded gatherings have evinced a deep stirring of the waters—a kindling of faith and spiritual ambition, a hunger and thirst after righteousness both social and personal, and a warm sense of brotherhood, which are the marks of true Christian revival. We believe that the time is propitious for expansion and advance in the life of the Church. Though a new Government enters into office, the possibilities of progress in the political sphere are narrowly restricted by the facts of national and international finance. The only enrichment we are likely to experience as a nation for many a year is enrichment of soul; and for such a task the Church of Christ alone has the necessary resources.

THE EARLY CHAPTERS OF GENESIS

A HUNDRED years ago the earlier books of the Bible were not regarded as presenting any special difficulty. The Bible, it was declared, was the Word of God, and therefore everything it said must be taken as true; all its statements were accurate statements of fact. In the popular view, at all events, the first chapter of Genesis was a literal narrative of events which actually took place in history. The only alternative seemed to be the denial of the inspiration of the Bible.

Of recent years, however, all this has been changed. Science and scientific methods have, to a large extent, taken the place of authority and tradition. Geology, astronomy, archæology, anthropology, and comparative philology—a bristling array—have all been brought to bear upon these early narratives; and their testimony is unanimous. It is no longer possible to hold the plain views which satisfied our forefathers. The Bible, it is said, and said with justice, must be subject to the same sort of criticism as other books, that have come down to us from antiquity. Its genuineness and its authenticity must be tested by the same methods as theirs. The critical spirit is abroad everywhere, and not even the most sacred records can claim to escape its scrutiny. Accordingly, the first books of the Bible, and especially the book of Genesis, have been studied and examined; and it was soon clear that the popular ideas about them would have to be modified. To begin with, it was found that the book of Genesis was not, as had always been held, a simple and homogeneous structure—the work of one writer. On the contrary, it is a compilation; it is composed of distinct documents more or less skilfully welded together. It contains double narratives of the same event—for instance, there are two narratives of the Creation and of the adventures of Noah—and several of these duplicates are inconsistent with one another. And then many of the stories in the book and of the facts related in it are contradicted by the results of scientific research. The accuracy of the book is called in question both on its literary and its scientific side. And the result has been what was to be expected. By many people the book, and especially its opening chapters, has been dismissed as a collection of legends of no value whatever. We shall do well to pause before we accept such a sweeping condemnation. I think it is possible to give up the untenable position that the book of Genesis is a piece of scientific history, and to concentrate our defence of it upon its religious value. That has not been seriously impugned. After all, we have no

reason to suppose that the Bible was meant to teach us science —to forestall what man might, in after ages, be able to discover for themselves. Rather its purpose is religious and moral; and in these fields of enquiry it remains what it has always been, a guide of unerring insight and unassailed authority.

It is sometimes said that to surrender an outpost is virtually to abandon the whole position. If you admit the fallibility of the Bible in one particular, you must do it in all. The book of Genesis is only the first object of attack; soon it will be the New Testament and the Christian Creeds. Nay—it is so already. Are not the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection even now being called in question? I am not greatly impressed with this line of argument, nor do I think the cases are really parallel. In the first place it closes the door against all change. We are committed to holding a position which must on no account be given up, which no new knowledge, no fresh evidence, no maturer consideration, can weaken in the smallest degree. And then most, if not all, of the conclusions reached by those who doubt the historical character of the book of Genesis, are not formed on arbitrary or *a priori* grounds. They do not depend upon any denial, or even suspicion, of the miraculous or supernatural. They are forced upon us by ascertained facts: "They follow upon a simple consideration of the facts of physical science and of human nature, brought to our knowledge by the various sciences concerned, from a comparison of these facts with Biblical statements, and from an application of the ordinary canons of historical criticism." Now this is obviously not the case with the great doctrines of the Christian faith. You may show that the Resurrection of Christ was unlikely or unnecessary, or that it rests upon inadequate evidence; but you cannot in the nature of things bring forward any contradictory facts to disprove it. This difference between the two cases seems to be important.

And here a question arises, which must be dealt with: Where science and the Bible disagree, which are we to follow? The Bible we hold to be the book of divine revelation; science also we hold to be divine revelation in other fields, and working by other methods. It is really inconceivable that in the end they should disagree. Such a supposition would render nugatory the work, not only of religion and philosophy, but also of science itself. For they are all avenues by which we seek to approach a common centre—the one eternal mind, in which all knowledge dwells, and in which all apparent contradictions must ultimately find their reconciliation. But in the meantime, until the goal is reached, there may, of course, be temporary misunderstandings and divergences. And so, when the question arises, we must,

I think, provisionally at all events, accept the conclusion of each in its own proper sphere of activity. The sphere of science is phenomena: its business is to ascertain and group and co-ordinate facts. It has no title whatever to draw religious or moral conclusions from them. That is the work of religion. In its own field we must accept the conclusions of science; but not until science itself tells us that they are final. Until then our wisdom is to keep an open mind.

The purpose of the Bible being mainly religious and moral, it can afford to accept the ideas on other matters, not germane to religious and moral truth, which were generally current among the people for whom it was written. Indeed, supposing the writers to have known the facts now revealed by science, it is hard to see how they could have given them to men unprepared by their outlook and training to understand them, without distracting their attention from the truths it was their business to teach. These things are beside the point in a moral and religious revelation. A very simple illustration will show what I mean. No preacher telling a country congregation that His friends carried our Lord's body to the sepulchre at the time of sunset would think it necessary to explain that in reality the sun does not set in the popular meaning of the term, though some of his audience might think it did. Human knowledge is progressive. Every advance means that the ground has been prepared beforehand; fresh knowledge does not come till the world is capable of assimilating it. That is, so far as we can see, a law of nature. Why should we expect it to be violated in a single case? Why should we expect God to reveal arbitrarily things that, after all, could not be understood and would not be assimilated, and thus to anticipate and make unnecessary the labours of future generations. That is not, I think, God's way of dealing with us. He does not tell men what they can discover for themselves. Divine revelation—the unfolding to man the mind and nature and purpose of God—is one thing. That must come by the action of God, if it is to come at all. The facts of physical science are on a somewhat different footing. Men can discover them for themselves; and, it must be presumed, were intended to do so.

But, in fact, science and Scripture have the same origin. Both are divine; both come from God. Their methods and processes and fields of operation are different. And this truth is gradually coming to be recognized. The opposition between science and religion, so marked and so bitter but a few years ago, is passing away. Men—even scientific men—are coming to see that the two are not incompatible or irreconcilable. It is only when one trenches upon the province of the other that the

old enmity flares up. The obvious deduction, therefore, is that each should confine itself to its own concerns.

We must not forget that revelation, as it is contained in Holy Scripture, has spoken its last words. New light may be cast upon it; but nothing can be added to it, and nothing taken from it. Science, on the other hand, is in its infancy. Some of its conclusions are final; others are likely to be modified by further discovery. And here we are called upon to use our own judgment. It is just as foolish to accept without question new ideas just because they are new, as to reject them because they run counter to our own preconceived opinions. What science tells us may be regarded as definitely established in her own field, we should accept. For the rest we should keep an open mind, ready to accept, when science assures us we may safely do so. No good end can be served by following the example of that pundit who refused to look through the telescope at Jupiter's moons, for fear he should see them and be convinced of their existence.

Much depends upon the attitude of the clergy in these matters. The charge of obscurantism, of closing our eyes to advancing knowledge, is easily brought; we should see that it cannot be brought with justice against us. The Roman Church set herself to oppose and deny the teaching of science in the sixteenth century; and with what result? No one now doubts the truth of the facts then for the first time put forward, and so hotly challenged; and Rome has never recovered from the discredit she incurred by her attitude towards them. After all, if we have any faith in God, we must believe that the truth will ultimately prevail. It may be that we shall have to give up some of our prejudices. Can we do so? I believe a great responsibility lies upon us. People may not say much, but they are looking to see whether the Church of England in the twentieth century is going to repeat the mistake of the Church of Rome in the sixteenth, and turn her back upon the light.

What, then, is the teaching conveyed in the early chapters of Genesis? They tell us:

1. That the world and everything in it was created by God, and was declared by Him to be good.

2. That man, when he appeared on the scene, was without sin, which I take to mean, not virtuous but innocent.

3. That man sinned by disobedience, that is by consciously setting his own will against God's.

4. That the fall of man was due to the desire for knowledge.

5.* That, as time went on, man fell more and more deeply

* See *Modern Criticism and the Teaching of the New Testament*, by G. A. Smith.

into sin; and that each successive stage in his spiritual decline was accompanied by a corresponding advance in material knowledge, prosperity and skill.

Truth in the realm of fact is not the same thing as truth in the realms of fancy, imagination, religion, or any other energy of the spirit; any more than prose is the same thing as poetry. Their appeal is different, and the standards by which they must be tested are different. These stories may be true in fact, or they may not. They describe human progress—growth in art and knowledge, side by side with growth in pride and insolence, until the end is reached in a great catastrophe. The cause is the same in each case recorded—advancing civilization without a corresponding advance in religion and reverence. Pride comes before the fall, pride of knowledge, pride of invention, pride of wealth. Is not that a true account, now as then? The old writer may not have had much critical faculty; he may have been simple and credulous. But he told his facts as he believed them to be, and gave his explanation of them; and can we say that his diagnosis was not correct? Could we, with all our accumulated knowledge and boasted powers of observation and inference, do any better? The later history of the world, and the history of the last few years, written as it has been in blood, have proved the accuracy of his insight. Growth in knowledge leads to pride, unless there be growth in reverence as well; and the end is one of those upheavals of society that throw back civilization for centuries. The writer of Genesis is concerned to show us that there is some mysterious connection between knowledge and boldness to do wrong. The tree of knowledge bears poisonous fruit. Its evil effects can only be countered by its antidote, and that is religion, or to put it in another way—a society can only be healthy when its moral keeps pace with its intellectual growth. And religion is the only true basis of morals.

That, then, is the teaching. The setting in which it is given us, whether history, poetry, legend, parable, or allegory, is of the smallest importance. People have quarrelled so much about the shell of the nut, that they have forgotten its kernel.

The fact is that historical accuracy is unattainable. We never get a complete picture, correct in all its parts and details. One of the outstanding events of all history was, I suppose, the surrender of the German fleet three years ago. It was intensely dramatic in its staging; and its consequences were incalculable. But of the accounts of it given by any six observers, no two would be alike. Differences of character and temperament and position and conception would make themselves felt in the narratives. Details would be omitted or emphasized. Indeed,

it is hardly too much to say that if two thousand years hence the accounts should be disinterred and subjected to the criticism to which the Bible is subjected to-day, so many discrepancies would be found in them, that the greater part of the story might easily be set aside as unworthy of credit.

And minute accuracy of detail, if it were possible, is undesirable. In order to establish this position, I will venture upon a quotation and an instance by way of illustration.

The quotation is well known, and I give it without comment. It is from *Modern Painters*, and the writer has been speaking of the place of mist in the economy of nature. He goes on:

"We surely need not wonder that mist and all its phenomena have been made delightful to us, since our happiness as thinking beings must depend on our being content to accept only partial knowledge even in those matters which chiefly concern us. If we insist on perfect intelligibility and complete declaration in every moral subject, we shall instantly fall into misery of unbelief. Our whole happiness and power of energetic action depends upon our being able to breathe and live in the cloud; content to see it opening here and closing there; rejoicing to catch through the thinnest films of it glimpses of stable and substantial things; but yet perceiving a nobleness even in the concealment, and rejoicing that the kindly veil is spread, where the untempered light might have scorched us, or the infinite clearness wearied. And I believe that the resentment of this interference of mist is one of the forms of proud error, which are too easily mistaken for virtues. . . . I know there are an evil mystery and a deathful dimness—the mystery of the great Babylon—the dimness of the sealed eye and soul—but do not let us confuse these with the glorious mystery which 'the angels desire to look into,' or with the dimness which, even before the clear eye and open soul, still rests on sealed pages of the eternal volume."

Now for an illustration, which seems to be pertinent. It will, at any rate, convey the impression I should like to leave, and suggest what seems to me to be the conclusion of the whole matter.

Many people are familiar with the St. Gothard Pass on the Italian side. Turner's picture of it is described and analysed by Ruskin, and I will quote a few lines of his description of the picture as compared with the reality:

"The whole place is altered in scale, and brought up to the general majesty of the higher forms of the Alps. There are a few trees rooted in the rock on this side of the gallery, showing, by comparison, that it is not more than four or five hundred feet high. These trees Turner cuts away, and gives the rock a

height of about a thousand feet, so as to imply more power and danger in the avalanche coming down the couloir. Next he raises to a greater degree all the mountains beyond, putting three or four ranges instead of one."

And so on. You will be struck at once by the liberties the artist has taken with his subject. He exaggerates features of the landscape or obliterates them at will; his details are supplied by his own imagination; he puts in here, he cuts down there; you would hardly recognize the reality in the representation. Set the picture beside a photograph, and its inaccuracies will be plain. The photograph gives you all the details, each in its proper place; all the proportions are preserved; not a tree or a stone but is faithfully delineated. Put it under a magnifying glass, and you might even see the flower by the wayside and the eddy on the stream. The contrast is complete. But which of the two would you sooner have in your study, to help you to recall the day when you toiled up the pass? Which of the two reflects most faithfully the majesty of the everlasting hills? Which gives you best the strength, the solemnity, and the desolation of frowning cliff and roaring torrent? There is something in the picture that is not in the photograph, and that something is life. The one preserves the dead framework, the other has caught the living message. The whole scene has been passed through the mind of the painter, and has taken an impress from it. The dry bones have been quickened by a breath of the spirit.

It is the old antithesis of St. Paul: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life"; and it seems to be a law of this imperfect world that we can only have the one at the expense of the other. Our generation prefers the photograph—the letter. We demand literal accuracy of detail—well, let us have it, if we can get it; but I believe that, notwithstanding all our pre-eminence in the arts and comforts of life—perhaps because of it—we are poorer in the things of deeper import—less open to ideas, less responsive to the intimation of things ineffable and inexpressible—than our fathers were. We have made our choice, and must, I suppose, abide by it; but do not let us lose altogether the vision of what we have given up, or imagine that what we have got in exchange for it is all net gain.

N. G. LAWSON.

HUMAN NATURE AND THE FALL—A NOTE

In his article on "Authority in Morals," published in THEOLOGY last May, Mr. Thouless speaks of a "tendency in Christian morals to see evil in the instinctive nature itself, and not in an absence of control of the instinctive nature." He afterwards calls this a "moral creed." That the tendency exists, and sometimes manifests itself, cannot be doubted, but where is this creed to be found? A creed should represent a settled conviction, consciously accepted, and promulgated with some sort of authority. "This appears," says Mr. Thouless, "in the Protestant tradition as Puritanism, and in Catholicism as Augustinianism and as Jansenism." The tendency, no doubt, appears there; but more conspicuously, I think, elsewhere. It produces a habit of thought, a comfortable persuasion that "humanum est errare," and, therefore, men should not trouble themselves unnecessarily about their sins; "semper in uetitum ruimus, cupimusque negata"; it is excusable; in case of need, some sort of supernatural aid will make good the defect of nature; God will see us through, if we put our trust in Him. This habit of thought is found, perhaps, most frequently in those who are opposed to Puritanism, to Augustinianism, or to Jansenism. The lady who said that "le bon Dieu" would think twice before sending to hell a woman of her quality was probably not under Jansenist direction.

But does Mr. Thouless mean that in Puritan, Augustinian, or Jansenist teaching there are formal elements which induce this habit of thought? It is not impossible. Mr. Pepys enjoyed this habit of thought to the uttermost, and he was bred among Puritans. Augustinianism is not the same thing as the teaching of St. Augustine, and I do not suppose that Mr. Thouless would accuse the African Father himself of adhering to the "moral creed" which he is discussing, but he will perhaps say that seeds of it may be found in his writings. Jansenism was but an extreme form of Augustinianism, distinguishable as the work of a small group of exact thinkers, who built firmly on the antipelagian treatises of Augustine. St. Cyran is said to have read these carefully at least thirty times. They do not contain the doctrine which Vincent of Lerin reprobated as novel, with an evident reference to them, but they do contain exaggerated statements which might be twisted into that doctrine. The Jansenists may have exaggerated those exaggerations, but they were faithful to the outstanding doctrines of their chosen master, and prominent in these treatises, emphatically repeated, is the great saying: "Omnis natura,

inquantum natura est, bonum est." There is sometimes added, "sed peruersitas eam malam facit." There is such a being as a bad man. But he cannot become "malum," an evil thing, for in that case he would cease to exist. According to Augustine, evil can be found only in that which is naturally good; it is a perversion, a defect, depraving that which in itself is good; total depravity is impossible. In his most exaggerated assertions of the inability of man, without the succour of divine grace, to do or even to will what is good, he means only that endeavour is thwarted by an acquired and habitual weakness.

As consistent Augustinians, Jansenists could not hold that instinctive nature itself is evil. In Pascal's incessant antithesis between the man who is raised by grace to the likeness of God and the man who sinks by the corruption of his nature to the level of beasts, there is no suggestion that animal instinct in man or beast is evil; it is meant only that here is not the proper level for man. "Quod equo natura est homini crimen est," said St. Augustine. To be subject to uncontrolled instinct is natural in a horse, and we therefore control him artificially for our use with bit and bridle, but for a man to be in that state is unnatural, a fault. In short, the Augustinian teaching, even when exaggerated, seems to be that which Mr. Thouless demands, placing evil not in the instinctive nature itself, but in "an absence of control of the instinctive nature, or the absence of due subordination of one instinct to another."

Mr. Thouless might justify his complaint by quotations from Luther in his grosser moments. There is the terrible saying in the Table-talk: "All natural inclinations are either without God or against Him; therefore none are good"; and there is the still more terrible argument drawn from a denial of all natural virtue: "Experience testifies this. . . . No hero undertakes great enterprises for the common good, but out of ambition, for which he is justly condemned: hence it must needs follow that such original, natural desires and inclinations are wicked." What experience! But Luther scorned consistency, teaching vehemently that marriage is glorious, and that man has a natural propensity thereto, which the Fall, though marring, has not destroyed. Nor was he followed in his more violent moods. The Saxon Confession, while affirming "totam deprauationem," added: "Discernimus autem appetitiones in natura conditas a confusione ordinis, quæ post lapsum accessit." This "confusione ordinis" appears to be exactly what Mr. Thouless, himself a good Augustinian, makes the root of evil. The Reformed Confessions, even at their worst, are yet more remote from Luther's extravagance. With the

possible conception of the Heidelberg Catechism, they find the seat of evil not in natural instincts but in the atrophy of the controlling will. The Synod of Dort even allowed that "residuum est post lapsum in homine lumen aliquod naturæ, cuius beneficio ille notitias quasdam de Deo, de rebus naturalibus, de discrimine honestorum et turpium retinet, et aliquod uirtutis ac disciplinæ externæ studium ostendit"; this light of nature failing only to bring men to a saving knowledge of God.

I have looked in vain for the "moral creed" which Mr. Thouless condemns. There is indeed a sort of loose popular thinking for which "instinctive nature" is evil, and such loose thought is truly damnable. But to call it a moral creed that appears in Puritanism or Jansenism is surely to say too much.

T. A. Lacey.

ST. STEPHEN'S PLACE IN CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

The distinction commonly met with in modern theology between "the Jesus of History" and "the Christ of Faith," indicates a gap in our knowledge of Christian origins which the mind naturally wishes to see filled. Liberal Protestantism tends to fill this gap by postulating an activity of syncretistic thought in the earliest Christian community which overlaid the simple primitive Gospel or teaching of Jesus with alien metaphysical ideas from other sources. The more penetrating criticism of Professor Lake and others sees the fallacy of this "overlaying" theory, but none the less cannot fill the gap except with a query. I wish to suggest that the time is opportune for a fresh treatment of the problem, partly because it is coming to be more and more admitted that "the Christ of Faith" as known to Catholic Christendom is to be traced right back to St. Paul and the Apostles themselves, and partly because the analysis of religious experience is becoming increasingly possible along scientific lines.

It is not difficult to sum up shortly what "the Christ of Faith" meant for St. Paul and St. John. For them, as for Christian dogma throughout the ages, Christ is the One from heaven, only-begotten of the Father, unique, that is to say, in kind among men, containing in Himself from all eternity the fulness of the Supernatural; who yet came to live as Man a life of perfect humility and love, and died a sacrificial Death, and was raised, soul and body, in glory. Exalted to the Father's side, He now sends down His Spirit on all believers, and by the Spirit's operation cleanses the faithful from sin in Baptism and imparts to them the supernatural life which belongs to and is

the predominant mark of the Kingdom of Heaven. This fellowship and participation in His Life He renews and strengthens in the Holy Eucharist, so that we are "in Christ" and He in us; members of His Body, the Church, and indwelt by His Spirit; and this Body is to extend to embrace all mankind. Christhood means mediation between God and man by a Divine-human Person, of heavenly, *i.e.*, supernatural, origin, yet "born of a woman," who died and rose again and ascended, and left the Church with His life-giving Spirit and Sacraments. By historical religion we mean that this offer of transference from the natural to the supernatural Life and experience has actually occurred in human history. We are not now concerned with the philosophical explanation or justification of this *mythos*, as Plato would have called it; but with its claim to be a *mythos* which came true. The examination of that claim can be reduced perhaps within more manageable limits to-day than at any time within the last hundred years. That this is so is due in part to Criticism, in part to the progress of Psychology.

The crucial point in this enquiry is St. Paul; for in him first the "Christ of faith" and the "Jesus of history" are explicitly and indisputably fused. Opinions may differ as to whether the Hebraic or the Hellenistic elements predominate in his Christology; but no one doubts that the Christ whom he believed in and served was, to his mind, both supernatural and historical. Moreover, Christ so conceived is inwoven into the warp of a spiritual experience of which he and his companion, St. Luke, give us full and detailed pictures. There is no one in the pages of the Bible whom we know so well as St. Paul; and when he says quite simply, "To me to live is Christ,"* we know that we have a perfectly genuine utterance of the heart. "It pleased God," he says, "to reveal His Son in me."† That is the essence of his testimony. It was "by revelation of Jesus Christ"‡ that his faith came. Not that he belittled instruction from others; he alludes to it more than once, and with gratitude. But it was the event we call his Conversion which was the supremely vital moment of his life. There, then, if anywhere we shall find an important link in the chain of evidence on which a just estimate of Christian origins must be built. There we have a fact not seriously denied, either as to its historical occurrence or as to its external antecedents and results, in any quarter. Psychology, moreover, illuminating many of its details, enables us to see lines of connection, both backwards and forwards, which are invisible to literary criticism alone. Here, in the soul of this man who lived intensely as Jew, as Roman, and as Greek—

* Phil. i. 21. † Gal. i. 16. ‡ *Ibid.* i. 11.

the heir of three civilizations—Christ enters with unquestioned vividness and power into human experience; we can isolate the moment from the rest of human history much as a scientist will isolate the relevant materials under a microscope; and we are able to say with considerable exactitude who this Christ is who thus enters, whence He comes, and whither He goes.

The Conversion itself is explained by Dr. Jung on its psychological side as follows:

"Although the moment of a conversion seems sometimes quite sudden and unexpected, yet we know from repeated experience that such a fundamental occurrence always has a long period of unconscious incubation. It is only when the preparation is complete, that is to say, when the individual is ready to be converted, that the new view breaks forth with great emotion. St. Paul had already been a Christian for a long time, but unconsciously; hence his fanatical resistance to the Christians, because fanaticism exists chiefly in individuals who are compensating for secret doubts. The incident of his hearing the voice of Christ on his way to Damascus marks the moment when the unconscious complex of Christianity became conscious. That the auditory phenomenon should represent Christ is explained by the already existing unconscious Christian complex. The complex, being unconscious, was projected by St. Paul on to the external world as if it did not belong to him. Unable to conceive of himself as a Christian, and on account of his resistance to Christ, he became blind, and could only regain his sight through submission to a Christian, that is to say, through his complete submission to Christianity. Psychogenic blindness is, according to my experience, always due to an unwillingness to see, *i.e.*, to understand and to accept, what is incompatible with the conscious attitude. This was obviously the case with St. Paul. His unwillingness to see corresponds with his fanatical resistance to Christianity. This resistance was never wholly extinguished, a fact of which we have proof in the epistles. It broke forth at times in the fits he suffered from. It is certainly a great mistake to call his fits epileptic. There is no trace of epilepsy in them; on the contrary, St. Paul himself in his epistles gives hints enough as to the real nature of the illness. They are clearly psychogenic fits, which really mean a return to the old Saul-complex, repressed through conversion, in the same way as there had previously been a repression of the complex of Christianity."*

The pure subjectivism of this explanation is in keeping with the whole method of empirical psychology, which is not as such concerned with objective reality: though the article which

* Proc. S.P.R., May, 1920, quoted by Mr. Thouless, THEOLOGY, I. 329, 330.

follows this is a reminder that strong grounds exist for regarding religious experience as supernaturally and objectively determined. But, even as it stands, Dr. Jung's statement raises questions beyond itself which would seem both to demand and to be capable of some answer on the same empirical plane. What was this "Christ-complex" which emerged from incubation into consciousness on the road to Damascus? Of what materials was it composed, and what occasioned its emergence? And what was its relation to that group or community into which St. Paul was received as a result of it?

1. It is common to speak of St. Paul's "vision" on the Damascus journey: but it is to be noted that none of the three records of the Conversion say or suggest that he saw Jesus. What he saw was a light: Jesus he heard. And the dialogue which ensues reveals something more than a simple emotional system. In the sentiment he had been repressing and struggling with, the emotional life was organized around the idea of an object which had, as it were, two faces. The first question, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" shows that his thoughts and doubts were centred in that Christian community to whose destruction he had been particularly commissioned and was devoting himself with ardour. It was that community which as a matter of fact he had been persecuting. And now it suddenly addresses him in the accents of a Person, and of One who speaks with authority. "Who art thou, Lord?" . . . "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." It is not simply "Jesus" whom he had been resisting; but Jesus embodied and incarnate in His Church. The Conversion is not simply from unbelief in Jesus to belief in Him: there is involved simultaneously an identification—the identification of the Christian community with its Lord. What he realized was two things together, that in persecuting the Church he had been persecuting Jesus and that Jesus was what the Church said He was—namely, "Lord." Among the elements which now suddenly became reassociated and regrouped in his mind there were not merely the ideas of right and wrong, of cruelty and humanity, of Jesus and of the Pharisees: there was also the idea of the actual concrete community, the men and women, whom he had been haling to prison or death.

2. We are driven back, therefore, from St. Paul's experience on the road to Damascus to his experience of Christianity beforehand.* It seems probable that he had not been in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion four years earlier; but he had been domiciled there for a decade or more before that as a student in the school of Gamaliel, and in those student days

* Batiffol has an excellent section on this in *The Credibility of the Gospel*, pp. 64-88.

the work and claims of Jesus may well have crossed the line of his thoughts. At any rate, this would certainly have been the case when he returned from a visit to Tarsus after the Lord's Death and Resurrection. Then he must have found the ecclesiastical circles of Jerusalem agog about the new movement; and, indeed, his own master, Gamaliel, was playing no inconspicuous part in the controversy. It is to this, if not to the earlier, period that St. Paul alludes in one of his Corinthian letters. "Wherefore," he says, "we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). He is thinking of the time* when he had known Him on the lips of rumour, credulous perhaps but critical, full of gossip as to details of what Jesus had said and done, yet without clue or conviction as to who or what He was. And we can be sure that he would hear all that was to be said against Christ—how He was a Pretender and a Sabbath-breaker and claimed to be God's Son and Messiah; and yet how He inspired a handful of Galilean followers with astonishing effrontery and a large measure of success.

All this he would hear and more, and so knew Christ "after the flesh."† But there was nothing here, perhaps, to compel decision. What compelled decision and rendered nugatory the moderate councils of Gamaliel was an ecclesiastical development which profoundly concerned both Christianity and Judaism. The situation has been described with his usual lucidity by Professor Lake. Among the Jews at Jerusalem three sections can be distinguished—viz.: (*a*) Orthodox Aramaic-speaking Jews, such as the Pharisees and Rabbis, of which Gamaliel and Nicodemus were typical; (*b*) Orthodox Greek-speaking Jews or Hellenists, such as, no doubt, St. Paul and his family were; and (*c*) "Liberal" Hellenists. So long as the Christian community could be regarded as a synagogue, having peculiar views indeed but not dangerously heretical, within the first of these groups, no serious trouble occurred. The critical event was the introduction into a central position in the Church of a new element—the element of "Liberal" Hellenism—through the appointment of the Seven (Acts vi.). "So long as, before their conversion, they had been merely 'Liberals,' or the Twelve had been merely believers in Jesus, each had been unpopular, but generally free from active persecution; but when Stephen, and later on Peter and Paul, combined

* For a full discussion of the reference in these words see Plummer, *in loc.*

† An instructive comment on these words is to be found in the description of the Jews' state of mind given in John viii. 15–30.

these causes of offence, the wrath of the Orthodox knew no bounds."*

The Christ, then, with whom St. Paul was most deeply concerned before his conversion, was the Christ of St. Stephen. In Stephen Jesus presented Himself to the consciousness of Saul in lineaments which were largely intelligible—the lineaments of "Liberal" Hellenistic Judaism. He whom Christians called "Lord" was now closely associated with a religious party or tradition which he had long known and to which he had a deep-rooted antipathy. The doubt he had experienced as to the claims of Jesus now settled down into a vigorous hatred. Rightly or wrongly, he identified Jesus with a contempt for the Temple and the Mosaic Law, which was already a dangerous feature in Hellenistic Judaism. He was convinced that this movement must be crushed, and he viewed with satisfaction the violent death of its eloquent Christian spokesman.

That is the first element to be noted in the Christ-complex which Saul was repressing. But there was another and a more potent one, and he had not reckoned on it. It was engendered in his mind by that very scene of Stephen's martyrdom which had seemed his moment of triumph. It has been truly observed that one of St. Paul's sensitive disposition was not likely to watch such human suffering as stoning involved without emotion. But there was something there to move him more than bodily pain; there was a sublime spiritual witness. And it is that spiritual witness which gives to St. Stephen his indispensable place in any true history of Christian origins. The experience of it made a haunting impression on St. Paul which never left him. The climax is thus described in Acts (vii. 55-60):

"But he [Stephen], being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God. But they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and rushed upon him with one accord; and they cast him out of the city, and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when

* *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i., p. 308. *Cf.* also *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 16 *ff.*; *Landmarks of Early Christianity*, pp. 57 *ff.* In the two last-named books Professor Lake makes it clear that he thinks the Orthodox *Hellenists* to have been the first to take serious offence at Christianity. In that case Christianity would have effected a reconciliation between the two parties of Orthodox Jews, the Hebraic and the Hellenistic—a fact wholly compatible with the high commission entrusted to St. Paul. For the position see also Professor M'Neile's *St. Paul*, pp. 8-11.

he said this he fell asleep. And Saul was consenting unto his death."

The question from which we must take our departure is the content and origin of Stephen's vision. In the first place it may be observed that it bears all the marks of the prophetic "trance" or "ecstasy." This mental condition appears as a common accompaniment of "apocalypse" or revelation, both in the first century and afterwards.* It seems to involve, in the language of psychology, a dissociated state of consciousness analogous to that familiar in dreams.† In this mental state there emerges a newly constellated mental system reconstructed out of the elements of previous conscious experience —memories, wishes, ideas, imaginations. Psychology as such is not concerned with the objective determination of any of these elements: it examines them simply as they occur in experience. It is obvious, however, that, if contact with, or knowledge of, God is humanly transmissible, and in so far as it is so, analysis of the psychological *media* of transmission is of great importance.

In the case of Stephen, it is possible to account for the elements reassociated in his vision with considerable accuracy. We have not only the narrator's description of how Stephen "saw the glory of God," but the martyr's own description in his own words: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Two features in this sentence go far to prove its essential authenticity. In the first place, "the Son of Man" was a title of our Lord which rapidly dropped out of use in the Christian Church. And in the second place, this is the only passage in the New Testament where the ascended Christ is spoken of as "standing" at God's right hand. Had the author of Acts put the words into Stephen's mouth, it is overwhelmingly probable that he would have used the ordinary Christian conception of Christ as "sitting" or "seated."‡ We may reckon, therefore, that we are dealing with an original utterance of St. Stephen.

The opening of the heavens to which he alludes is a significant feature of prophetic vision. Thus, Ezekiel relates that "the heavens were opened," when he saw his visions.§ A similar experience befell Christ at His Baptism.‖ "The heaven was opened" for St. Peter, when the universality of the Gospel was revealed to him,¶ and for the Seer of Patmos before he saw the Divine Figure on the white horse.** In every case the experience coincides with some revelation that was felt to be

* See *The Christian Prophets* (E. C. Selwyn, D.D.), pp. 5 *f.*, 12 *n.*

† *Cf.* Dr. Morton Prince in Mrs. Arnold-Forster's *Studies in Dreams*, pp. 13-15.

‡ *Cf* Acts ii. 30; Col. iii. 1; Heb. x. 12, xii. 2, etc.; 1 Pet. iii. 22.

§ Ezek. i. 1. ‖ Matt. iii. 16. ¶ Acts x. 11. ** Rev. xix. 11.

especially momentous, and led in fact to momentous consequences. The mention of it here is sufficient by itself to establish St. Stephen's place in a line of spiritual happenings of the first importance for the history of religion.

But the essential content of the experience is contained in the second clause, "and the Son of Man, standing on the right hand of God." The words recall us at once to Christ's own prediction before Caiaphas: "Nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 69, *cf.* Mark xiv. 62). It is not easy to determine, in view of the discrepant records, the exact form which our Lord's words took on this occasion; and it is not impossible that the apocalyptic terms used were somewhat heightened by those who heard and reported them.* At the same time it would be an arbitrary treatment of the evidence which would decline to allow that Jesus did before Caiaphas assert the prospective vindication in experience of His supernatural claims, and assert it in terms closely parallel to those which He had used on earlier occasions in His ministry. The utterance belongs to that eschatological strand in our Lord's Teaching which has puzzled criticism for a generation; and this is not the place—nor is there any need—to revive that discussion. Suffice it to say that Christ's prediction of an imminent revelation of the Supernatural in human experience through the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven centred in the "Son of Man" seems to be more and more recognized as a cardinal element in His message; while the attempt to argue that He did not identify the Son of Man with Himself shows no signs as yet of overcoming the inherent difficulties which beset it.†

I have said that St. Stephen's experience recalls our Lord's utterance before Caiaphas: it recalls it, because it fulfils it. For it is the experience of the ascended Christ, invested with the glory and authority of heavenly power. The ascendancy which marks the Lord's relations with all with whom He had intercourse—with the Twelve, with the possessed, with the crowds, with the common people, with Mary, with Caiaphas and Pilate—seemed at the Crucifixion to be extinguished. By the Resurrection it was restored in the hearts of the disciples. In the Ascension it was completed, freed from the limitations of

* *Cf.* Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 430. But the company at this trial, though mainly composed of "enemies," no doubt contained some secret adherents, and these latter may be the source of the narrative.

† I have dealt at some length with this whole problem in my book, *The Teaching of Christ* (Longmans, 1915), ch. v. I believe that the main drift of the arguments there used still holds good; though the connexion of St. Stephen's vision with our Lord's prediction before Caiaphas renders possible a simpler explanation of it than I there urged.

time and space, and made available for all mankind. St. Stephen, the first martyr, is the witness, not only to Christ but to Christ ascended: indeed, it was because he first grasped the full implications of what the Ascension meant that he suffered death before any of the Apostles. Was Christ from heaven or of men, natural or supernatural, divine or human? St. Stephen confessed him supernatural, divine, heavenly, in terms which none could mistake and which sounded the death-knell of Judaism. There was nothing to be done but to do away with him.

But we may go further. His last words were a prayer for pardon for his enemies. A negative criticism will no doubt claim that we have here simply the imputation to Stephen of a noble trait in the death-scene of his Master. Were that so, it would be more natural to find the words more closely approximating than they do; and if St. Stephen was the first to reproduce in martyrdom the spirit of His Lord, experience even in our own day shows that he was not the last.* More natural is it to suppose that it was the wounded Jesus whom St. Stephen saw in that moment of intuition; and that it was the sight of those wounds which melted him to his knees with the cry of prayer for his enemies, overcome by the love and compassion of Christ. Thus from the open confession of Jesus as the ascended Lord he is led on to proclaim the Ascension as the victory of pitying, pardoning love.

This scene was watched by one who took no active part in the violent deed, but consented to it. Saul had a training and education behind him which would have made him ill at ease in a frenzied crowd; but he was on its side. It was a righteous penalty. And yet, even as he watched, he felt the pricks. Though he had decided his own answer to the controversy about Jesus and was resolutely opposed to the notion that He was "from heaven," there were things in what men told of Him, even "after the flesh" (2 Cor. v. 16), which kept tipping the balance on the other side. He could not rid himself of the germs of a Christ-sentiment, try as he might. Jesus whom they crucified—how could he be the Son of Man? That question still recurred. And when he heard Stephen's words, he knew enough of what Jesus had claimed to catch the connexion. His mind would go back, indeed, trained rabbi that he was, behind the reputed words of Jesus to the prophecy in Daniel. Certainly it had been prophesied that "one like unto a son of man" should be "brought near to the Ancient of Days" (Dan. vii. 13). There were words of Jesus which seemed to say that Daniel's vision, and still more its development in Enoch,

* *Cf.* the evidence from Russia, THEOLOGY, V., pp. 224 *ff.*

was on the verge of fulfilment. Could Jesus be that Son of Man after all? Did this strange community of Galileans and Hellenists represent that kingdom of the saints foretold in prophecy? These were questions with which no doubt St. Paul was familiar. And now he heard them answered in circumstances which made the answer peculiarly impressive. Here was someone of superhuman courage and magnanimity, who said that he *saw* Jesus as the Son of Man exalted at God's right hand. A faith so attested and bearing such fruits could not be utterly foolish. And so his doubts grew. He must act, if he would drive them away; and he obtained the commission to help to extirpate the heresy.

But in fact he was already conquered. The sentiment he had so resolutely disowned waxed stronger and stronger. He could not deny the Supernatural on the face and lips of St. Stephen. He could not rid himself of the thought that its true Source was what St. Stephen said it was—Jesus, crucified but ascended. Nor could he dissociate the persecuted community from the Lord whom St. Stephen confessed. And at last the conviction burst through into full consciousness, as he journeyed to Damascus. That which had haunted him with mysterious and authoritative instancy now stood revealed. "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Jesus Crucified is the Supernatural Son of Man. Jesus is the Life and constitutive principle of the Christian community. The Church is that kingdom of the saints of which prophecy had spoken.

There are many other ligaments, of course, binding the Catholic faith of St. Paul with the Jesus of history as our documentary sources portray Him. But this is the central one and the earliest in time.

And it has in it what we may call, to continue the metaphor, certain points of special tension. There is first the culmination of our Lord's claim in the prediction before Pilate; secondly, the Ascension; thirdly, St. Stephen's experience of the crucified and ascended Lord; and lastly, the impact of this experience upon the mind of St. Paul. Thus, the analysis of two moments of religious experience, both of which are described for us in minute detail in our evidence, leads to the recovery of a forgotten factor in the story of Christian origins—the factor of the Ascension. It is safe to say that hitherto the Ascension has been regarded by critical students of Christian origins as a stumbling-block rather than a link in the evidence. That a doctrine so fundamental as that of the Ascension should be thus brought back into the main stream of Christian apologetic in itself lends weight to the argument or theory which requires it. The Ascension is thus presented as the change in our Lord's condi-

tion which enabled Him to enter into religious experience though withdrawn from the human limitations of time and space. And it presents itself with the character of necessity, to those at least who accept the broad evidences of the activity of the Supernatural in human consciousness. Without it we cannot explain either Christ's prediction or St. Stephen's vision: with it, we have the fact which gives full significance to them both (*cf.* John vi. 62, xvi. 10).

Again, we must note that the Christ of Faith who thus passes from the mind of St. Stephen to that of St. Paul exhibits in the experience of both those two "notes" which mark the Jesus of Synoptic history—the note of supernatural authority and the note of complete humiliation and meekness. These two ideas provide, indeed, the contexts in which nearly all the Synoptic allusions to "the Son of Man" appear.* Our Lord seems to have chosen the title† as the best available for connoting that paradox of Divinity in Humanity which lay at the root of His consciousness; and it is of significance that precisely the same paradox should be found on the lips of the two first witnesses who knew Him by faith alone.

E. G. SELWYN.

GOD AS PSYCHOLOGICAL REALITY

THOSE of us who are philosophically inclined and are interested in the mutual interactions of psychology and religion are always finding ourselves faced by the problem which has become crystallized in the somewhat clumsy formula, "the objective validity of religious experience." This is the question of whether the mental experiences of religion, whose value we recognize, can be taken as indications of the existence of a real Being who is their source. For most of us, indeed, if they cannot, they must lose all their value. Unless the God of our religious emotions is real, we have been in our religious moments only the victims of a pitiable self-deception.

Some writers, however, consider that it is possible to evade this problem by the adoption of some formula which is designed to conserve the usefulness of religious conceptions while denying to them any reference to real objects. This is not a new method in thought, but it has received a new impetus from one of the founders of a school in psycho-analysis—Dr. Jung, of Zurich.

* Cf. *The Teaching of Christ*, p. 149.

† Professors Lake and Foakes Jackson follow Wellhausen and Wrede in believing that our Lord did not call Himself by this title, but that it was given to Him later. I have discussed the formidable difficulties of this view (as they seem to me) elsewhere; cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 138, 139.

Since there are many earnest (but not, I fancy, very clear-minded) religious believers who appear to welcome Dr. Jung's evasion of the problem of the reality of religious objects, I propose to devote this article to a brief examination of this evasion, in order to see whether it can be regarded as philosophically or practically satisfactory.

Dr. Jung makes a distinction between *actual truth* and *psychological truth*.* He claims psychological but not actual truth for religious belief. The test for the psychological truth of the religious symbol appears to be the pragmatic one. He says: "It is *psychologically true*, because it was and is the bridge to all the greatest achievements of humanity." The distinction is explained as follows: "True reality is one that is relatively universally valid; the psychologic reality, on the contrary, is merely a functional phenomenon contained in an epoch of human civilization."† He considers that there is a positive mental disadvantage in the belief in the objects of religious experience as *true realities*. "It is a positive creed which keeps us infantile and, therefore, ethically inferior." The course of moral autonomy would be for man to be able without compulsion to "wish that which he must do, and this from knowledge, without delusion through belief in the religious symbols." He does not desire a simple abandonment of the religious symbol, but a change in attitude towards it. The "psycho-analytic cure for belief and disbelief" is that we should "keep the beauty of the symbol, but still remain free from the depressing results of submission to belief."

The position here adopted is not merely that his psychological method leads Dr. Jung to believe that the reference of religious experience to a real object is philosophically unsound, but that this reference to reality destroys its value in mental economy. This value he believes was originally the control of the libidinous forces of instinct—a control which has been accomplished so effectively that these forces are now hidden from our consciousness, and we hardly know against what it had to protect us. "For enlightened people, the so-called religiousness has already approached very close to a neurosis."‡ The mere removal of the religious control, however, may easily lead to a return of the old licentiousness, which Dr. Jung considers is already happening in our larger cities. Hence the necessity for a psycho-analytic cure of disbelief as well as of belief.

* *Psychology of the Unconscious* (English translation, London, 1915), p. 262 and note 42 on p. 529.

† This sudden change from "actual truth" and "psychological truth" to "true reality" and "psychologic reality" does not make for clarity of thought, but possibly Dr. Jung owes the confusion to his translator.

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

The *moral autonomy* for the sake of which belief must be got rid of is a conception which is not made sufficiently clear. Presumably, if the objects of religion were real no moral autonomy would be gained by believing that they were not, or, if it would, no intellectually honest person could gain moral autonomy at the price of a false belief. So we are led back to the philosophical question of the soundness or unsoundness of the reference of religious experience to real objects.

It is clear that the unreality of religious objects cannot follow immediately from any results of psycho-analytic treatment of religious experience. Though psycho-analysis may show (if, indeed, it can) what are the psychologic roots of a mental fact, it does not follow that it has not also roots in reality. Dr. Stekel gives an account of a young man who invented a device for lighting lamps at a distance and became rich by his invention. Psycho-analysis showed that his desire to light lamps at a distance was a symbolization of his desire to light a love for himself in the heart of a girl who slept in a neighbouring room. The invention, however, was a real one. Pfister has suggested that the eloquence of Demosthenes resulted from the common mental compensation of stutterers for their deficiency, but it remains an actual and not merely a psychological truth that Demosthenes was eloquent. So the belief in God may be a mental compensation for the harshness of this world, or (as Dr. Jung maintains) the organization into a system of the "regressive reanimation of the father-and-mother imago"; yet it may well be the case that the God whose reality compensates for this world and who is the object of this filial love belongs to *actual reality*.

Is the distinction between psychological and actual truth really a useful or a valid one? Its recommendation is that it should make possible retention of all that is valuable in the attitude of religious faith without any assumptions as to the objective reality of its objects. Perhaps it may do so for minds prepared for the *metapsychological* point of view by the acquirement of the habits of mind resulting from a prolonged study of psycho-analysis. But of what value can it be to the uneducated devotee who prays because he believes that a God as really existent as himself hears his prayer? We may bewilder him by explaining that although there is no God it is exactly the same as if there were, provided only that he retains the same attitude towards a non-existent deity as he previously adopted towards the God in whose existence he believed. If we make him believe us, we shall not leave him praying. His mind has not been so sophisticated that he can blur the distinction between existence and non-existence. If his God has no reality outside his

own mind, he knows that his prayers are useless, and that he would be more rationally employed in addressing petitions to a stone which, although unconscious, is at least real. So the formula of *psychological reality* proves to be useless just where it is most wanted. The educated man who may be able to accept it has little tendency to relapse into primitive licentiousness when the control provided by religious faith is removed; the uneducated worshipper, who may have no other cultural control than his religious faith, will not be able to keep the latter by a rationalization which asserts the psychological reality of its objects.

Perhaps we can claim more and assert that there is a presumption in favour of the reality of the objects of religious experience to be drawn from the fact (if it be a fact) that the religious adaptation to the world is a valuable one. Our practical test for a real thing is that we must behave in a different manner with respect to it and to an imaginary thing. If a real chair stands in our way, we must make movements in order to avoid it or we shall bark our shins; not so an imaginary chair. I propose to express this difference by calling our behaviour towards a real object an *adaptative reaction*. In terms of behaviour, what we mean by asserting the reality of a thing is that our reactions towards it must be adaptative. A person who makes adaptative reactions towards imaginary objects or who fails to make adaptative reactions towards real ones is insane. He has lost his sense of reality.

A man who keeps up the religious modes of behaviour is making adaptative reactions towards the object of religion. If we ask him to keep up these adaptative reactions and to believe that they are a rational mode of behaviour, but not to believe in the reality of the object towards whom they are addressed, we are asking him to do something which pragmatically has no meaning. His belief in the reality of God is his belief that adaptative behaviour towards God is reasonable. The oneness of these two beliefs is the product of an intuition found dependable in the external world—an intuition founded on the observation that objects towards which he must adopt adaptative behaviour are the same as those towards which other people must make adaptative behaviour. If it be admitted (as apparently Dr. Jung admits) that the ends of the organism can only be attained by adaptative reactions towards the objects of religion, then this fact suggests that these objects possess the same kind of reality as those of the outside world.

R. H. Thouless.

THE DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE IN INDIAN RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

PROBABLY there is no country in the world which in this century affords so rich an opportunity as India for the examination of the meaning of the presentation of sacrifice as the characteristic action of religion. It is not merely that the most ancient religious writings extant dealing with sacrifice are Indian, or that they are so abundant alike in variety and extent, covering vast periods of time; but the supreme interest lies in the fact that throughout the length and breadth of the country these sacrifices are still being offered, and that from end to end of India, both in villages and towns, altars are still red with the blood of buffaloes and goats. For instance, in the second city of the British Empire, Calcutta, in the temple of Kalighat, can be found to-day an epitome of the history of sacrifice in India. Within the temple itself vegetarian offerings are made in accordance with the rules of the Tantras, and only Brahman priests are allowed to officiate. In front of the shrine and in full view of the monstrous image of Kali is the porch where learned Brahmans recite the Vedas and make offerings of rice and ghee in fire in accordance with the ancient Vedic ritual. Beyond this spot, again, goats and buffaloes are beheaded, and the blood poured out before the goddess. Neither the worshipper nor the priest does the killing, but a man of the caste of blacksmiths. The head is given to the sacrificing priest, who presents the blood to Kali; the body, drained of its blood, goes to the worshipper and is partaken of in a feast as sacred food. In addition to these forms of sacrifice, representing respectively the ages of the Veda, the Puranas, and the Tantras, Brahmans point out the place where once human sacrifices were wont to be offered. To-day all these sacrifices, not excluding even the human, as the newspapers recount from time to time, are being offered in India.

At first sight we should suppose that people in whom the idea of sacrifice was so deeply implanted would joyfully welcome a religious system of doctrine and worship which, instead of dismissing their sacrifices as futile and superstitious, offered them a spiritual interpretation and fulfilment of all that they were feeling after. What better field than India could the Christian missionary have for his proclamation of the One Priest and of the One Sacrifice with its continual presentation in the sphere of the spirit? But if we must confess that it is disappointing to find that this sound instinct which requires priest and sacrifice for its satisfaction seldom leads Hindus to

seek rest in the Christ and His Sacrifice, yet it is only fair to remember that the effect of Judaism was very similar, wonderfully ordained as it was to prepare men's minds for "such a High Priest" as "became" them. The vast majority of the Hebrews did not use their spiritual system as the means by which they advanced to the knowledge of the consummating Priest, but even used it as a barrier by which they cut themselves off from accepting Him. They, like the Indian peoples, were satisfied with priests "having infirmity," and with "the blood of bulls and goats" which could not take away sins.

But an examination of the sacrificial systems of India cannot be altogether fruitless in throwing light on those unconscious forces in mankind which, operating silently from age to age, have produced religions that dominate vast masses of the human race. We have to remember that behind the positive religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, which are due to religious innovations believed to be organs of divine revelation, there are more ancient beliefs, usages, and institutions common to the majority of mankind. Semites and Aryans alike, in the dim ages of the past, were moved by ideas which impelled them to sacrifice, and their thoughts, if we can unravel them, may have a direct and important bearing on spiritual religion. The New Testament and Christian theology are based on ideas of sacrifice and priesthood, but the ideas are not new; they presuppose notions already current among mankind. We propose to seek in Indian literature and in the present-day practice of sacrifice in India to see if we can find among them any ideas which may illuminate our faith.

It is commonplace knowledge that the earliest known effort in India to solve the problem of the universe is found in the religious hymns of an invading Aryan race. These ancient, and by no means peaceful, emigrants into India spoke a language which is the common source both of Vedic Sanskrit and of the modern Aryan languages of Europe. Arriving at the upper reaches of the Indus and there taking up their abode amidst plenty, they sang their songs of praise to their deities. The hymns themselves were originally known as *Brahmans*, but in later years this name was transferred to their composers and guardians. Driven east by new bands of invading Aryan emigrants, they found a rest in the river valleys between the Ganges and the Jumna and called their new home the "Midland." It was here, scholars tell us, that the hymns were collected and became the Hymn Wisdom of India—the *Rigveda*. The gods whom they celebrated were undoubtedly the forces of nature personified who were supposed to possess human attri-

butes and yet were deemed immortal. To these gods they offered sacrifice consisting of the burnt flesh of animals and intoxicating soma juice.

It must be confessed that the first great idea connected with sacrifice in the *Rigveda* is not ennobling. It is simply that it secures prosperity. By sacrifice I get something for myself. It is an investment of gold-edged security. Sacrifice makes the earth fruitful; it protects from enemies; it promotes good health. Deity after deity is appealed to on the basis of sacrifice, or, as some would say, the help of the one god is invoked under different names. Here are some of the prayers offered with the sacrifices:

" We have taken thy right hand, O Indra, longing for riches; rich lord of riches, we know thee, lord of cows. Hero, give us varied wealth of cows and bulls " (*Rigveda* X. 47, 1).

Indra, who is especially the giver of material wealth, is besieged with sacrifices, but there is no disguising the motive with which they are offered. They are an investment in which the capital is to be returned with heavy interest. The god is to be supplied with soma, in pails, in rivers, in lakes, in oceans—to such hyperbole does the language grow—but he is confidently expected to give in return with lavish abundance to those who thus present sacrifice to him.

At times the deity is almost rebuked for not being responsive enough to the sacrifices that are offered:

" If I might reign, O Indra, as thou, I the giver of wealth should want to enrich my worshipper. I would not leave him to misery " (*Rigveda* VII. 32, 18).

" Giver of much, give much, bring us not little, bring much; surely, Indra, thou wishest to give much " (*Rigveda* IV. 32, 4).

He is even implored to put an end to the man who does not offer sacrifice, and transfer the miscreant's wealth to the stores of the more devout:

" Slay him who brings no oblation, hard to reach, not pleasing to thee. To us give his wealth: this is what thy worshippers expect " (*Rigveda* I. 176, 4).

These passages are typical. The hymns which contain them are probably the earliest in date. They seem to express an unblushing greed, or at any rate to be based on the belief that the system of sacrifice was a divinely ordained method of bargaining.

This belief obtains to-day throughout India. The vast mass of Hindu worshippers present their sacrifices in the hope of getting generous returns in kind. Frequently they deliberately bargain: " If my son recovers from his illness, I will sacrifice two goats to Kali "; " If I pass my examination I will offer

three goats"; "If I obtain admission into the provincial service I will sacrifice a buffalo." So widespread is this conception of sacrifice, which has come down from the dim distant days of primitive Aryan worship, that it is difficult to eradicate it from Christians. Even a sick child will try to make his bargain with God: "If I get better, I will give a rupee in church." "If I get better," but not unless. It has been said that prosperity is the reward of the service of God offered in the Old Testament and adversity in the New Testament. No doubt it is largely true that material blessings are offered in the Old Testament in return for loyalty to Yahweh, and material misfortunes are threatened against the disobedient, but the initiative is nearly always on the Divine side. Man does not normally approach God and promise that if his crops are good he will be obedient; it is God who is represented as proclaiming that to the obedient prosperity shall be given. There is, indeed, an instance in the Old Testament of what seems at any rate on the surface an attempt at a bargain, when Jacob says: "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on . . . of all that Thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto Thee" (Gen. xxviii. 20-22). But this is abnormal in the Old Testament. The general teaching is rather that of Deuteronomy xxviii., where the blessings are offered by God to man in response to diligent obedience and not claimed by man from God.

If one is inclined to be so depressed by the unblushing greediness in the motive of some of the earliest sacrifices of the Aryans, the hymn to Liberality may act as a partial corrective, for there we read the praises of a generous spirit of kindness to the poor: "Truly the wealth of the liberal man does not waste; truly there is no comfort for the miser" (*Rigveda* X. 117, 1).

We may pass now to a quite unexpected and remarkable thought in the *Rigveda* about sacrifice. It is not regarded only as a means of extracting wealth, nor is it only a method of cultivating fellowship between gods and men, but it is a duty which is obligatory on the gods themselves, and upon the fulfilment of this duty of sacrifice the very existence of the universe depends. The gods are said to have sacrificed *Purusha*, a human giant, with the result that be became the source of all creation. "As a victim on the sacrificial altar they anointed the man who was born in the beginning; him the gods sacrificed." The whole of a hymn (X. 90) is occupied with a description of this sacrifice, though strangely enough no mention is made of the power to whom the sacrifice is offered. "They consecrated him as a sacrifice on the grass, Purusha, born in earliest

time; the gods, the sadhyas, and rishis sacrificed by him." Curiously enough the origin of the castes is ascribed to this stupendous sacrifice out of which came the world and all that is in it. "In how many parts did they distribute Purusha? In how many parts arrange him? What do they call his mouth, what his arms, what his thighs and feet? The Brahman was his mouth; his arms made the Rajanyas; his thighs were the Vaisyas; from his feet the Sudras were born." Strange and fantastic as much of the hymn must seem to modern ears, yet dimly we can perceive in it the thought of a life poured out for the life of the world and itself the source of life. The bargain-idea in sacrifice is not unexpected, but this profound thought of a great sacrificial surrender lying at the root of all that is, and of this sacrificial surrender being incumbent on the Divine Being as well as on saints and good men, casts a shadow beforehand of something incredibly great and splendid. Even for the establishment and upholding of the old world was needed the sacrifice of "the man who was born in the beginning," "the first Adam," we might almost venture to say. In the establishment of the New Creation, when once men realize the need of the new heavens and the new earth, they will anticipate that some stupendous sacrifice will be called for. There are two hymns which give a detailed account of the sacrifice of the sacred horse, which was one of the great events of the old Vedic world. Even the post to which the victim is tethered, and the hatchet with which he is slaughtered, are carefully described. An exact account is given of the division of the body, and of every fragment of the sacrifice being devoured by the worshippers. The good horse is highly praised for surrendering himself to the sacrifice, which he is said greatly to enjoy. He is promised as a reward that he shall have a place in heaven where he shall help to draw the chariots of the gods. But there is no hint of the significance of this sacrifice. It seems, from the account, mainly to minister to the selfish enjoyment of the worshippers. But there was probably something far deeper than that.

There is in one of the hymns of the tenth book an obscure verse which is worth quoting, because it seems to foreshadow the supreme doctrine in the Christian religion of the God-provided Sacrifice, the surrender of the Divine Life in pain for the sake of mankind:

"He who for the gods' sake chose death, he who for man's sake did not choose immortality, Brihaspati the rishi was made a sacrifice, Yama gave up his precious body" (X. 13, 4).

Brihaspati is in the *Rigveda* the name of a deity who personifies the action of worshippers in its effect upon the gods. He

is the suppliant, the sacrifice, the priest, who intercedes with gods on behalf of men and protects mankind against the wicked. Sometimes he is called the "father of the gods" and wide creative functions are attributed to him. He is designated as "the shining," "the gold-coloured," and as "having the thunder for his voice." Here we have a conception which more than hints at the thought of a Supreme Sacrifice.

Further, the phrase "Yama gave up his precious body," though unquestionably obscure, yields something to those who rightly love to find in these most ancient hymns anticipations of the truths which are in the Church's treasury. Yama is the god of the dead with whom the spirits of the departed dwell. Does it mean that this priest who was also sacrifice overcame death, and so Yama gave up his precious body? If so, the devout Indian Christian who has passed from Brahmanism into the Catholic Church may recite, with a meaning especially his own, "He rose again *according to the Scriptures*." However this may be, in that brief sloka we have plainly a far nobler conception of sacrifice than that of a bribe or a bargain, and it may lead men to enquire where such a Sacrifice, who is also the Priest living to make intercession, may be found.

The period following that in which the hymns of the *Rigveda* were gathered together witnessed an immense extension of the sacrificial system. The efficacy of sacrifice is constantly glorified. It becomes a mysterious or magic operation which compels the gods to give. But the rites and ceremonies must be exactly and accurately carried out. In the literature called the *Brahmanas* the sacrificial cult and ritual are elaborately set forth. The more intricate became the ceremonial the more powerful became the man who alone knew the want of it, and thus the power of the Brahman priest was constantly in the ascendant. He drew up the *Brahmanas* and constantly elaborated the ritual of which every single detail must be precisely performed or the sacrifice were invalid.

By degrees it came to be believed that by means of sacrifice a man might be exalted even to the position of a god. The priests were spoken of as gods upon earth, and they became far more the objects of fear than the gods in heaven, for earth seemed considerably nearer and smaller than heaven.

"There are two kinds of gods; for the gods are gods, and priests that are learned in the Veda and teach it are human gods." We might parallel this kind of teaching with popular beliefs, actually expressed in words, as to the power of priesthood in parts of Christendom, but the purpose of this article is not controversial. We have seen a tract in which the language applied to the power of the Christian priesthood, and the glorifi-

cation of the priesthood, was uncomfortably similar. In the case of the *Brahmanas* the fees paid to these human gods were equivalent to the sacrifices offered to the celestial gods.

It was in this Brahmana period, possibly 800-500 B.C. (no dates are very certain), that the doctrine of the substitution of animal or vegetable sacrifices for human was developed. Dr. K. M. Banerjee, a famous Brahman convert to Christianity in the first half of last century, who passed from orthodox Hinduism to atheism and thence to Christianity, indeed doubted whether human sacrifice was ever offered in India in the Vedic period, or that the institution ever existed among Indo-Aryans. "It was almost unexceptionally in the worship of Sakti, as wife of Siva, in her blackest form, that such murderous oblations have ever been heard of." Max Müller and Weber, however, are quite sure that the evidence establishes the fact, and that human sacrifices are referred to in the *Satapatha-Brahmana*. In the *Mahabhavata*, the huge epic whose compilation extended over a great period of time, we can trace the different stages of the conception of sacrifice. The poem gives evidence that human sacrifice was still performed at times, but it was already being regarded with grave disfavour. The priest who performed it would be cast into hell. For all that it is interesting to recall that the famous Chinese traveller, Hiouen Tsang, narrowly escaped being a victim to Turga when on his visit to India during the first half of the seventh century. Turga is still a most popular goddess in Bengal. Nor was it only human beings who were dependent on sacrifice; it was equally obligatory on the gods. It was only after Manu had sacrificed Vedic sacrifices that a daughter was produced and the earth repeopled after the flood. As is well known, the tradition of a vast destructive flood which swept away the whole population is found in Indian primitive literature. Noah's sacrifice after the flood was no doubt eucharistic, but Manu's was offered that the earth might be replenished.

The gods not only depended on sacrifices in the sense that they themselves were compelled to offer them, but also it was taught that without them they were unable to exist and work divinely. Indra, without sacrificial soma, was unable to perform his great works. Vishnu obtained the chief place among the gods because he first compassed the end of sacrifice.

Again, it was not only men on earth and the gods in heaven who were helped by sacrifice; the manes, the shadow-like spirits of the dead, were also benefited; for sacrifice sent them to live in the higher world. Then, again, there is no difficulty in tracing the parallel between certain aspects of Christian teaching, though there is no elaborately worked out scheme

by which particular sacrifices give relief for a definite number of days.

We find traces of all this teaching in the *Mahabhavata*. Here is a passage which sums up much of it:

"Law comes from usage; in law are the Vedas established; by means of the Vedas arise sacrifices; by sacrifices are the gods established; according to the rule of the Vedas and usage, sacrifices being performed support the divinities."

There is also some connection of sacrifice with forgiveness of sin, for we read: "Whatever sin a king commits is atoned for by sacrifice, if accompanied by large gifts to priests, such as cows and villages." The sentence introduced by "if" throws light upon the reputation of Brahman priests in India which they retain to this day. The most famous passage in which sacrifice and sin are connected is in the Tandya Maha Brahmana. After the slaughter and dissection of the victim the sacrificing priest says as he offers each portion to the fire: "Thou art the annulment of sins committed by the gods. Thou art the annulment of sins committed by the fathers. Thou art the annulment of sins committed by men. Thou art the annulment of sins committed by ourselves. Whatever sins we have committed by day or by night thou art the annulment thereof. Whatever sins we have committed sleeping or awake, thou art the annulment thereof. Whatever sins we have committed knowing or unknowing, thou art the annulment thereof. Thou art the annulment of sin, of sin."

There is one remarkable fact recorded of the district of Calicut in South-West India. The King of Quilacan (modern Quilon ?) was always the sacrificing priest. There is a presumption that in other parts of the world priest and king were one, for the royal taboos were similar to the priestly taboos. The King, being also the priest who sacrificed the victim for the tribe, had to commit suicide after a certain definite period, and the death of their King-Priest was believed to be of the highest benefit to the whole community. He died for them. It is unnecessary to elaborate the profound significance of this. We place our whole hope in the King-Priest who died "for our sins, and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world."

Among the elements in the Hindu doctrine of sacrifice there are some that are ignoble, and there are some that are more elevating, but one dominating thought underlies them all, and that is, the stupendous power of sacrifice both over gods and men, and as a corollary the unlimited power of those who alone knew the secret of the complex ritual. We have quoted above a sentence which shows the priesthood in an unattractive light, but there was a higher ideal. In the *Satapatha Brahmana* we

read: "The sacrifice is like a ship sailing heavenwards; if there be a sinful priest in it, that one priest would make it sink." In fairness we must acknowledge that "sin" has often in Hinduism a significance different from what it has with us; it may refer to ceremonial defilements rather than to moral evil. But at any rate it is acknowledged that something more than being "letter-perfect" is required of the priest.

The stupendous power of sacrifice was believed and is believed to lie in this: That by the effusion of a victim's blood a force is liberated which is able to lead the gods to the will of men, and to admit men into the Divine Life. Tearing aside lesser considerations and taking a big view of sacrifice in India, we can see that for thousands of years the peoples of India have been educated to believe that only through sacrifice was union with God possible, and that the power of sacrifice was unlimited and incomparable. The Christian Church is the heir of all the ages, and fulfils the dumb expectation of mankind by proclaiming an Eternal Sacrifice through which union with God is offered and an inexhaustible spiritual force is set free.

Greatest of all is the thought that God Himself is the Initiator of sacrifice, and that He gives Himself. "To them [the gods] the Lord of creatures gave himself. He became their sacrifice. Sacrifice is food for the gods. He, having given himself to them, made a reflection of himself which is sacrifice. Therefore, they say, the Lord of creatures is a sacrifice, for he made it a reflection of himself" (*Satapatha Brahmana* 836). Again, "The Lord of creatures offered himself a sacrifice for the gods." No wonder pious Brahman Christian scholars have delighted to find in these words a hint or even more than a hint of a primitive tradition of the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," who yet was "over all, God blessed for ever."

The unexpected turn to the thought in the making of "a reflection of himself" is bound to remind us of the Son who is "the effulgence of His glory and the very image of His substance," and if we have in any true degree got at the meaning of the Sanskrit words the thought is profoundly Christian. For the Sacrifice which Christianity proclaims is the Sacrifice of God. It is the Father who provides the Sacrifice, and that Sacrifice is "the reflection of Himself." It is even more than the providing of the Sacrifice that we attribute to God. He is the Sacrifice, for the Son is the Very Image of the Father.

We can thus dimly find in the Vedas the idea of the identification of the sacrificer with the victim. Indeed, in one sloka the actual phrase is used: "The sacrificer is the victim. It takes the very sacrificer himself to heaven" (*Taittiriya Brahmana* 202). Again, Christians can remind themselves that here in the

far distant ages of the past it was recognized that man can offer nothing to God with which he was not identified. So also we cannot be united with Christ in offering the Holy Sacrifice unless we are made one with Him. We must bring our bodies to be offered with His body; we must bring our souls to be offered with His soul; we must bring our spirits to be offered with His spirit. We cannot be apart from the sacrifice as we offer it. We must be in it. "The sacrificer is himself the victim." It is the only response possible to God's sacrifice. As "the Lord of creatures gave himself," as "He became their sacrifice," so must the creatures, who are indeed sons, give themselves, identified with Him who is the true "reflection" of the Father.

W. H. G. Holmes.

AN ENGLISH "CONGREGATION OF RITES"

There is so much confusion of ideals concerning ceremonies in the Church of England that to urge a stabilized ceremonial is almost a commonplace. The term applied to the manifold expressions of English ceremonial is "Liberty"; but it is not so much liberty as an excessive individualism, plus a learned pedantry. Opposite to erudition is the personal taste of the "ignorant" priest, whose scant attention to ceremonial detail agitates the worshipper who has a reverence for order.

Within the fold of the Anglican Church is to be found every possible shade of ceremonial expression, from an "ultramontane" fidelity to excessive individual caprice. Between these extremes exists a multiplicity of diversities, which, however carefully examined, cannot bring conviction of an ordered and legitimate liberty.

A liberty of conscience and action, which has no further authority than the individual concerned, is dangerous. Mill, in his *Essay on Liberty*, remarks that "in all things which regard the external relations of the individual, he is *de jure* amenable to those whose interests are concerned, and, if need be, to society as their protector." If we read for "society," "the Church," we perceive how the personal predilections of the individual must, for the sake of the Church's peace and concord, be made subservient to the common good. In effect, individual conceptions should be merged into the general consensus of faith and order, even to the surrender of a cherished opinion.

We may, with propriety, argue that, though the Church of England shelters both "Western" enthusiasts and extreme

modernists, there is a background of a common acceptance of certain fundamentals, which we will call, for convenience of expression, Catholic Usage. This Catholic Usage has its minimum, which is an altar or table, and an Order of the Holy Communion.

It is time for the Church of God in this land to find a *modus vivendi* by which the fidelity of priests and laity shall not be too severely tried.

I. The Church of England has no Voice which speaks ex Cathedra.

No utterance from Canterbury or York is considered binding on the conscience of the provinces. Every statement, of course, is received with respect, but it is also subjected to examination, a scrutiny which promptly accepts or rejects *according to the individual opinion of the examiner.* Any encyclical is accepted with reservations; there is no Voice which speaks with Apostolic authority, demanding obedience. And for the reason that no Apostolic Encyclical has been promulgated, mainly because of the confusion engendered and developed by the trend of history, and the influence of English political history upon the outward expression of English Church life, this babel has become more pronounced since the advent of the Oxford Movement.

Leaving aside the pure individualists, two groups may be discerned within one that may be called broadly the Anglo-Catholic Movement; and though they are united in principle for one ideal, they are in two camps when that ideal is formulated in ceremonial acts. Behind the two ceremonials are two sentiments: the one, historic and national; the other, historic and pan-ethnic.

(*a*) *The "English" Catholics.*—"English" ceremonial is said by its exponents to be derived from pre-Reformation service books, notably from Sarum. Morse, Dearmer, and Clarke are in many quarters regarded as sound interpreters of the English medieval Rite. The endeavour is to restore an interrupted development, to resuscitate a national Catholicism. But all three show divergences. The limits of this essay will not permit an examination of these differences; they are sufficiently slight to create little or no argument, but the existence of these variations also emphasizes the personal interpretations of the three scholars mentioned and the evil of Anglican Congregationalism.

It would be true to say that "English" churches have many uses founded on the original, from a pedantic literalness which

savours of museum research, to a grafted use on a Victorian High-Churchism.

The main features of the "English" Use are: Gothic chasubles; albs and amices for servers; the reading of the Epistle by the sub-deacon (who must be in Holy Orders) facing the people; the celebrant standing at the altar during the singing of the Creed; reverent bows where the Roman rite has genuflections; the important position occupied by the Clerk; the reciting of the psalm *Introibo* as a processional preparation; and the omission of the last Gospel, except as a recitation from altar to vestry. The regulation of lights is noticeable, and there is a marked difference between "English" and "Roman" concerning the question of the rank of feasts.

The philosophy of the "English" movement may be briefly analyzed thus: The Church of England is suffering from an arrested development, and liturgical activity in the Catholic revival must commence from ante-1549.

But the objection to this argument is obvious: Can it be safely said that an uninterrupted progress would inevitably have resulted in to-day's "English" ceremonial? In other words, Does ceremonial remain static?

The answer to the latter question is, manifestly, No. The ornate ceremonial of a High Mass is the mature and grandiose aspect of an earlier simpler form, but it is not final, and "final" does not of necessity imply a still further exploration into ceremonial intricacy.

This attitude of mind towards the question of arrested development is possibly responsible for the austere and remote atmosphere of scholarliness which is apparent in "English" ceremonial.

One thing may be said in its favour: it rightly interprets, with its dignified restraint, the temperate emotion of the English race. The great disability under which the "English" Use labours is that Churchmen do not know on what lines Anglican ceremonial would have moved if the Tudors had not arrested it. The purists cannot diverge from their position without being disloyal to their ideals, and, consequently, the "English" Use remains in a condition of suspended animation, awaiting the Voice of apostolic authority to revive the dry bones of an exhumed ceremonial.

(*b*) *The "Western" Catholics.*—English Ultramontanists have not the same difficulties to face as the Nationalists. Their philosophy is very simple. "Here is a living Catholic ceremonial," they urge, "unarrested, and still developing with logical consistency. This is a ceremonial which moves in unison with the devotional demands of each generation

and does not go beyond them. It is Western Catholicism, and we are Western Catholics." But the same obstacle faces them as it does their "English" brethren; they do not know how English ceremonial would have developed if it had not been interrupted. They have a ceremonial ready at hand, but it is alien, and is not germane to the country. An imported ceremonial is one way out of the Anglo-Catholic impasse; but there is no guarantee that it is really in harmony with the devotional instincts of English Churchpeople. A continental exuberance, grafted on to the suppressed emotionalism of Anglo-Catholics, makes Roman ways fall into the condition of an attitude. The English Church groans under a heavy yoke, that of an academic ceremonial artificially applied.

The "Western" ritualists are frankly contemptuous of any ceremonial or liturgy which does not bear the imprimatur of the Holy Father. This contempt goes so far as to make some priests assert that, in celebrating the Mysteries, they interpolate the Prayer-Book Rite. The explanation is that patriarchate is above local use; but it is a very modern plea, going no further back for precedent than the suppression of Gallicanism.

On the one hand, we have a school who pay a perhaps too excessive regard for ante-1549; on the other, there is a school which pointedly contemns anything which is not modern Continentalism.

The rift is too wide to be bridged with the material at hand.

And here, again, the differences in the "Roman" churches are only too obvious. Every fine gradation of ceremonial observance is to be found. This is, again, Anglican Congregationalism, and the Voice of Authority is silent.

There is an insouciant rebelliousness about the "Westerners" which compels an attention that the "English" Catholics fail to attract. They insist on keeping in the foreground debatable matters of modern Roman developments, such as the rite of Benediction, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and the papal claims. Living dogmas demand notice.

The two groups can never be reconciled on their present programmes: one is restrospective, scholarly, and with a fine reverence for National Use; the other anticipatory, sedulously imitative of a Continental Rite, and pan-ethnic, with a central authority, sitting in the Eternal City, regarded as the Final Appeal in matters concerning Faith, Practice, and Ceremonial.

We must face the truth squarely, and accept the inevitable. The two parties will never be reconciled; they differ in almost everything, with the exception of their common ideal—the

restoration of Catholic ceremonial to the Church of England. Beyond this there is hardly a point of contact.

The voice of authority must speak, as clearly from Canterbury and York as from the Vatican. There must be a Pax Anglicana.

II. Anglican Congregationalism and the Consequent Need for an English "Congregation of Rites."

The evils of Congregationalism in the Church of England are very apparent. We boast of a liberty, but it is a freedom which leads us more and more into a morass of confusion. The whole tradition of a parish is often uprooted, to the despair of a well-ordered congregation, at the capricious taste of a new incumbent. Around us are signs of wreckage. The Prayer Book, in its preamble, asserts that ". . . whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this Realm . . . now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use." The National Use has disappeared, as a result of many influences, too numerous to catalogue; and instead we have parish uses, ranging from a meticulous fidelity to Roman or Sarum tradition, to the use peculiar to a parish and clergy hypnotized by passing enthusiasms and cults. No Churchman is the possessor of the happy confidence of being sure of what will normally take place in *any* parish church at Mass or Evensong.

What is the remedy? The answer will be partly found in the Prayer Book on, "Concerning the Service of the Church":

"To appease all such diversity . . . the parties that so doubt, or diversely take any thing, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese."

The Bishop, then, is the final authority. But the modern bishop, apart from his other qualifications, is not often conversant with the *rationale* liturgical ceremonial.

Let each Bishop call into being a diocesan Congregation of Rites, who will formulate a book of ceremonial observance for the details of public worship. This Congregation will give a *maximum* and a *minimum* of ceremonial acts, so that some guarantee will be given that the limits, at either end, will not be exceeded. It would, furthermore, test the *bona fides* of the diocesan clergy, and really discover who are loyal to Authority. A diocesan Use would come into being, and priests would be cognizant of the Use in the particular diocese they wish to serve.

Out of the many diocesan uses will crystallize a Provincial Use, if loyalty has been engendered and developed between

bishops and clergy. This Provincial Use will emerge by a process of liturgical evolution when angular contradictions will have been gradually eliminated. The two Uses of Canterbury and York may well work independently for many years, until —but this is vision—one Use will be the normal in England; a National Use, with its maximum and minimum. An English Congregation of Rites, working with the approval and authority of the two Metropolitans, will regulate all the detail connected with the services of the Church. It would not be impossible to issue an Anglican "Baldeschi" which bishops and priests would be constrained to study and practise, and there would be heard again the living voice of the English Church. Diocesan papalism would be avoided; for a bishop would be unlikely to set aside the regulations and recommendations of a Congregation constituted as suggested.

Ritual observance should be made a compulsory subject of examination for candidates for Holy Orders. The utter neglect of this important branch of priestly service is at the root of the present distress. The majority of Anglican clergy are blandly oblivious to the duty they owe to their congregations. They argue that ritual does not matter; but it does, and very materially. A north-end position and a Convocation gown and hood is a ritualistic obeisance to a Protestant idealism. An iron ceremonial would lead to spiritual atrophy, but between an artificial rigidity and a reckless unconformity can be found a true freedom of observance, with a background of common use, which would demonstrate to the worshipper the essential integrity and unity of the Church of England. A certain visible coherency would be an invaluable moral support to distracted communicants, and would strengthen loyalty to Mother Church in England.

A Congregation of Rites may point the way, not only to a better observance of the Prayer-Book Rite as it stands, but to a lasting revision on sound lines.

T. Varteg Evans.

[We can hear several of our readers making comment, "Poor Bishop!" But there is much truth in Mr. Evans's diagnosis, even if we doubt his precise remedy.—Ed.]

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We have had sent us a paper entitled *From Marriage to Marriage*, which was originally read in 1890 before the Evangelistic Committee of the East London Church Fund by the Bishop of Southwell, then Rector of Stepney, and has now been reprinted by request. It is packed with pastoral experience and wisdom and shows what thoroughness in the priest's work means. It is to be had of The Secretary, Church Extension Office, 24 Low Pavement, Nottingham. Price 4d.

Some time ago we drew attention to a remarkable sermon entitled *The Apostolic Succession*, preached by the Dean of Wells shortly before the Lambeth Conference of 1920. This was followed eighteen months later by an address of equally permanent value on the *Congé d'Elire*, published by Messrs. Mowbray at 9d. The address brings out clearly the reality underlying what is far too often regarded as only a form.

We have arranged to publish next month a further series of Anglo-Catholic Congress papers including those read by Canon Ollard and Mr. Mozley at Manchester, by Mr. T. J. Hardy at Newcastle, and by Professor Nairne and Canon Osborne at Norwich.

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the enquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

[Under this heading we hope to give simple explanations of New Testament passages intended for the non-specialist reader. Special attention will be paid to those passages where the R.V. rendering is not universally accepted by present-day scholars.]

St. Mark vi. 3: *οὐχ οὗτος ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας . . .* (*Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary . . .?*)

The conception of the carpenter of Nazareth has had a potent influence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It has been used as a kind of stick with which to beat the Church. The Lord you pretend to worship was a working man, it is said, one of the proletariat, and popes and prelates cannot pretend to represent Him truly. In view of this widespread feeling it is worth while to enquire what precisely a Nazareth carpenter was and did. And, quite apart from it, every Christian must feel an intense interest in the earthly conditions of our Lord's life.

This passage of St. Mark is our only authority for our Lord's occupation. The parallel passage of St. Matthew (xiii. 55) leaves a strong presumption that He followed Joseph's trade, but only says: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Origen, challenged by Celsus, said, "Nowhere in the gospels current in the Churches is Jesus Himself described as a carpenter;" so the copies of St. Mark known to him had evidently been assimilated to St. Matthew, as have been some MSS. still preserved. The First Gospel's modification of St. Mark has been attributed by some to a feeling that it was undignified to represent Jesus as a manual labourer. Such a feeling is unlikely to have arisen in the Jewish-Christian circles from which the First Gospel originated. Still more unlikely is the suggestion that "son of the carpenter" is Semitic for "carpenter." Probably "the carpenter's son" is a mere variation with no special significance for "the carpenter, the son of Mary." It is worth noticing that in the mouth of detractors "son of Mary" may have had an invidious meaning. To mention the mother's name in place of the father's was most unusual and would convey the imputation that Joseph was not the real father of Jesus.

The original meaning of *τέκτων*, like that of the Hebrew *ḥārāsh*, which it always represents in the LXX, was a worker in stone, wood, or other material, according to context. The Latin "faber," which translates it in the Vulgate, is similarly used. The following examples illustrate the use of *τέκτων*: 2 Sam. v. 11, *ἀπέστειλε τέκτονας ξύλων καὶ τέκτονας λίθων*, "carpenters and masons." 1 Chron. xxii. 15, *οἰκοδόμοι λίθων καὶ τέκτονες ξύλων*. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12, *ἐμισθοῦντο λατόμους καὶ τέκτονας*. Sirach xxxviii. 27, *πᾶς τέκτων καὶ ἀρχιτέκτων*, "every artificer and workmaster" [Heb. "he that maketh carved work and cunning device" (Oesterley)]. The two passages already quoted are the only occurrences in the N.T. The word is not found in the Apostolic Fathers, and occurs once in the Apologists—Justin *c. Tryphone*, 88: *ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο, ὢν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά*, "He worked these works of a carpenter while He was among men, ploughs, and yokes."

The last passage bears witness to an early tradition that Jesus was a carpenter in the sense of a worker in wood. So does Celsus when he remarks that Jesus, being a carpenter, was nailed to the wood of the Cross. Milligan and Moulton (*Expositor*, VIII. ii. 275 *ff.*) quote a fourth-century papyrus in favour of this limited sense.

But there were other traditions in the early Church. St. Hilary on Matt. xiii. 55 says Joseph was a blacksmith ("fabri erat filius ferrum igne vincentis"). St. Ambrose's comment on Luke iii. 25 seems to consider Jesus was a builder ("hoc typo patrem sibi esse demonstrat qui fabricator omnium condidit mundum"). A remarkable passage in the Acts of Thomas (c. 3) has not often been quoted by commentators. Thomas, as well as Jesus, is a *τέκτων*, working under Him as a slave. Abbanes buys him and asks, *Ποίαν ἐργασίαν οἶδας; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἐν μέν ξύλοις ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγοὺς καὶ τρυτάνας καὶ πλοῖα καὶ κώπας πλοίων καὶ ἱστοὺς καὶ τροχίσκους, ἐν δὲ λίθοις στήλας τε καὶ ναοὺς καὶ πραιτώρια βασιλικά* ("What work do you know? He said, In wood—ploughs and yokes and scales and boats and ship's oars and masts and wheels; and in stone—slabs and temples and royal residences") Lipsius—Bonnet II. iii. 103. A little later (c. 17, II. ii. 125), the same is repeated in similar language: *ποίαν τέχνην ἐπίστασαι; λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἀπόστολος· τὴν τεκτονικὴν καὶ τὴν οἰκοδομικὴν . . . καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν· Οἰκοδομεῖς μοι παλάτιον; ὁ*

δε ἀπεκρίθη· Ναί, οἰκοδομῶ καὶ τελίσκω· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦλθον, οἰκοδομῆσαι καὶ τεκτονεῦσαι.

The τέκτων here is a builder, working in wood and stone. The special sense of τεκτονικὴν and τεκτονεῦσαι in the second quotation seems to be the architect's work rather than one department of the builder's work. The entry in a Modern Greek Lexicon is instructive: "τέκτων· A carpenter (for building): overseer of buildings; architect; οἱ (ἐλεύθεροι) τέκτονες the (free)masons."

So far the evidence is equally balanced; and τέκτων in the Gospels may be considered to mean either a builder who included carpentering among his works or a carpenter in the restricted sense. There remains a consideration which seems to weigh down the scales in favour of the wider sense. Wood is and was scarce in Palestine. "Houses were made of bricks or clay; but hewn stone was not uncommon" (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. "Handicrafts"). "At the present day clay-bricks are used in the plain, stone in the mountains" (art. "House"). This leads us to suppose that τέκτων in the Gospels unqualified by any material is not restricted to a worker in wood. If our Lord was a builder, passages like Matt. vii. 24-27—the parable of the two houses—and Matt. xvi. 18, "Upon this rock I will build My Church," acquire a new meaning.

In any case our Lord would have been a small master-man, working with His hands but also planning the work and responsible for its success on the business side. He must have bought His materials from merchants and have known the difficulty of financing an enterprise. He must have sent out bills and insisted on their being paid, knowing that otherwise His own responsibilities could not be met. It is suggested that the references to business in the parables are based on personal experience as well as on observation of others. Insisting as a general rule on debtors paying up, He may well have found it wise as well as kind to say to a customer in difficulties: "Take thy bill and write four score." Jesus was the Ideal Business Man as well as the Ideal Workman.

BOOK PRICES

Some remarks on the price of theological books may interest our readers.

Let us take a book of 250 to 300 pages, of which the publisher, before the war, printed 1,000 copies. The cost of production would have varied with the amount and intricacy of the composition, but might have worked out at 2s. a copy. The publisher's unavoidable expenses, including advertising, could not have been reckoned at less than 25 per cent.—that is, 6d. a copy. Let us suppose the price was fixed at 5s.—economically, it should have been more. The rate of discount to the bookseller would have varied, but if allowance is made for some copies sold to America at a very low price (necessitated by a hostile tariff designed to keep English books out), 33⅓ per cent. may be taken as an average. The publisher, therefore, got 3s. 4d. for each copy sold. The margin between the cost of production and the proceeds of sales was 3s. 4d. less 2s. 6d. —that is, 10d. a copy. If profits were divided equally between author and publisher, each would get about £20, if all the copies, except those sent for review, etc., were sold. The return was little enough for the author, and quite insufficient for the publisher as an inducement to face the risk of loss.

But 1914 now seems in retrospect a golden age. The same MS. which we have been considering would now cost about 5s., for the composition, which has risen most, is the main ingredient in such a work; 25 per cent. for publisher's expenses brings up the cost of production to 6s. 3d. The published price should be 12s. 6d. if the 1914 proportions are preserved, but the publisher probably argues that the book will not stand more than 10s. The proceeds, if the edition is sold out, amount to 6s. 8d. a copy, so that the margin of profit is practically wiped out. But if 1,000 were sold before the war at 5s., the sale now at 10s. will not exceed 500, owing to the lessening of interest in theological pursuits and the poverty of scholars. The proceeds spread over the whole edition therefore work out at 3s. 4d. a copy, as against a cost of 6s. 3d.

How, then, are theological books being published at all? it may be asked. There is still a market for popular books by good authors. These probably sell better than before the war, because they have fewer competitors. But the average book which cannot expect much circulation has been squeezed out, unless the author is prepared to pay for it. This is a real misfortune. Especially in religious matters, there are always authors willing to pay in order to have their views disseminated. But books published in such circumstances are often less deserving than those written by authors who happen to have no money. A large proportion of the books now being published are issued at their authors' expense. The situation is highly unsatisfactory, and no obvious remedy suggests itself.

Can we Dispense with Christianity? The Question: its Crux and Implications for the Modern Mind. By F. W. Butler. Student Christian Movement. 5s. net.

There must be a preliminary question, Can we dispense with religion? Those who wish to eliminate religion from human affairs, and to replace it by science or philosophy, will make short work of such a question. For them one religion is as much a complex of truth and superstition as another, and they think that the truth can stand without the help of its religious settings. But there are those for whom religion in some form is still central and basic, and such persons are compelled to come to terms with Christianity in its varied manifestations. Mr. Butler's is one of the numerous contemporary efforts to meet the needs of this class of investigators. Unless we misunderstand him, the gist of his argument is this: "The permanence of Christianity depends upon its place in the scale of valuation of religions. There are certain well-defined human needs which religion satisfies, and religions must be graded according to the degree in which they are competent to meet these needs. The supreme value of Christianity lies in its gospel of the Resurrection—*i.e.*, its confident assertion that the Life embodied in Christ was ultimately triumphant. We need this gospel—the assurance that the fruits of moral struggle do not fail from off the earth. The real alternative is not between Christianity and some other synthesis, but between Christianity and universal doubt."

This, although not by any means the whole of the case, is quite a good point, but we do not know exactly what class of reader will dig it out of Mr. Butler's book. He obscures his moral by a rather "abstract" style, and by a large number of miscellaneous quotations. Perhaps it was a little ambitious to treat his subject in so academic a manner in 200 pages, since the best manuals of the student movement have been those suited for popular reading.

A. C. Bouquet.

NOTICES

NEGLECTED GALILEE: AN ATTEMPT TO READ BETWEEN THE LINES OF THE GOSPELS. By Vivian MacMunn. George Allen and Unwin. 1922. 5s. net.

The first pages or two of *Neglected Galilee* promise good entertainment. Then wandering fancies, monstrous between-line readings, put you off. Still you go on, and attention is recovered by this remarkable essay.

St. Paul tells of 500 brethren who saw the risen Lord. He knew who these were: we do not. Mr. MacMunn guesses a society of Galileans, gathered by our Lord as a veritable Church during His ministry. With them He used to eat the agape. He instructed them about the coming of the kingdom, not at the end of the world but really in the present; they were to live worthily of the kingdom now on earth; the Sermon on the Mount was His law for this earthly kingdom of heaven. They went to Jerusalem to risk their lives with Him. He, knowing Himself about to die, promised to meet them for the Passover (at the proper time) in Galilee, and He kept His promise. They saw Him by such a seeing, an experience, as St. Paul could understand.

But few besides St. Paul could understand. The Church of Jerusalem, disillusioned socialists who were sure that the kingdom could not be lived on earth, turned the poor in spirit into the poor, the Galilean kingdom into the commonplace eschatology of the period. Mark partly, Luke audaciously, modified the record of our Lord's words. Jerusalem rose up against Galilee's ideas, agapes, simplicities. Something of the Galilean spirit was recovered by St. Paul, more of its tradition was restored by St. John. But on the whole and in the long run Galilee was neglected.

> The difference, writes Mr. MacMunn, between the aspirations of Galilee and Jerusalem appears very plainly by comparing the Sermon on the Mount with the parable of the Prodigal Son. The former makes, of course, a demand for ideal perfection impossible to mortal man. In the latter, which for all its beauty does not seem our Lord's own, the Father says to the elder Son—God says to the Jew—"Son, thou art ever with Me, and all that I have is thine." In other words, for that seems the general moral, if the Jew could only add to his existing qualities a compassionate love for the outcast all would be well with him, and he would have nothing further to desire. Christianity for Jerusalem is Judaism plus compassion. The man who penned that parable had drunk deeply of Christ's Spirit. Christ Himself might have spoken that parable had He been an inhabitant of Jerusalem. But, in fact, He was a Galilean; and one cannot but suspect that the men who had lived with Him so long were never quite at home in the Temple, and were heartily glad to go out into the world, leaving Jerusalem in the hands of James.
>
> Nor do I think they minded very much what Jerusalem might think of Galilee.

They did not mind: Mr. MacMunn has been rather irritating by a sensitiveness in his argument to possible symptoms of controversial bias in passages which seemed innocent till he turned them outside in, but he concludes harmoniously:

Whether one speaks of the mutual attitude of the Galileans and their assailants as controversial or not, it is obvious that the attitude was in either case the result of loyalty to our Lord. It was His credit that Jerusalem was trying to save when it rejected the notion of a Galilean community or a Galilean resurrection-appearance. And the Galileans doubtless owed their patience to their memory of Him who said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing." Our debt to both is more or less equal. If to Galilee in the last resort we owe the record of our Lord's sayings, we should never without Jerusalem have possessed a record of His life.

Neglected Galilee again and again recalls *The Brook Kerith*. In both there is the homeliness, the rude faith of Galilee; the austere idea, hardening into even fierce demand for renunciation; the strange mingling of a large and rational with a provincially traditional explanation of the Gospel impulse. In both there is ingenious reading between lines, now convincing, now astonishingly crude. To take that rider to the parable of the Prodigal Son as the main moral instead of the generous doctrine of Divine forgiveness—how perverse! And yet, allow that not indeed the Lucan parable but the Lucan riders do reveal the Evangelist and not the Master; how curiously that does fit in!

And in both *Neglected Galilee* and *The Brook Kerith* there is a hovering breath of spiritual beauty. Mr. Allen's fine printing, too (at so small a sale price), is not unworthy of comparison with the handsomeness of *The Brook Kerith*. And though Mr. MacMunn is no such artist as Mr. Moore, his plain directness renders him very readable.

Students of *The Fourfold Gospel*, too, will be reminded of Dr. Abbott's thesis; John intervening to restore the primitive naïve record when Luke had sophisticated it. They will think also of Dr. Abbott's minute philosophy and multifarious elaborations of hints in the text. But then the difference will strike them. Mr. MacMunn weakens a good argument by embroidery. Dr. Abbott's fancy is erudite: touch after touch tells; he moves within the bounds of exact scholarship. Mr. MacMunn impresses, then repels, then wins your attention again—no doubt because he really has a truth to tell which luckily cannot be spoiled. Dr. Abbott seems all abroad at first, improbable; by instance after instance stiff with fact, he compels, if not assent, at least silence, respect, a decision postponed. He not only has a truth to tell, but labours and sweats to tell it truly.

Translations of Christian Literature: *Hippolytus, Philosophumena*. 2 vols. By F. Legge, F.S.A. London, S.P.C.K. 1921. 30s.

Mr. Legge's Introduction is a really good piece of work, well worth reading if only to learn how it was that the first book of the *Philosophumena* was attributed to Origen or Caius of Rome, and how it came to pass that the discovery of the MS. of the later books made it tolerably certain that the author was the mysterious Hippolytus of Portus. Most people are aware that the MS. found in the middle of the last century contains the remarkable story of Callistus, the fraudulent slave of Carpophorus, who insinuated himself into the favour of Pope Zephyrinus, whom he afterwards succeeded. They also have heard of the famous statue of Hippolytus found in Rome, with a list of his works on the back of the chair

on which the author is seated. But who was Hippolytus? Even Eusebius did not know this; and a long controversy, in which Bunsen, Döllinger, and Bishop Wordsworth took part, ended in the general acceptation of Döllinger's theory that he was the first Antipope. Mr. Legge's careful discussion makes him out a most interesting figure in Church History. The two rival Pontiffs, Callistus and Hippolytus, both acknowledged to have been saints and martyrs, were evidently exceptional men. Callistus, whose name is among the lawful Popes, was the leader of the party of a more merciful discipline, evidently popular, a versatile character, unscrupulous, if we may believe his rival, but never contemptible. Hippolytus, on the other hand, was a rigid adherent of ancient custom, a skilful controversialist, and an uncompromising upholder of his position as a ruler of the Church. Mr. Legge makes him attractive to us as a great lecturer. He had known Irenæus and had made heresy his speciality. He was undoubtedly a man of immense learning, and was not exempt from the faults of those who have read too hastily to combine accuracy with erudition. His literary faults are those of a successful lecturer. He makes blunders in his allusions to the philosophers of antiquity; he promises to show that each of his heretics is a plagiarist of an older philosopher, and does not always perform his promise; he is careless and at times obscure, he introduces his account of Simon Magus with a story about parrots, which may have been effective in securing the attention of an audience, but seems to the reader foolish and irrelevant. Nevertheless, his book is still of interest to us, especially after the reading of the Introduction, in which Mr. Legge has some very suggestive remarks, notably those which refer to the real condition of the Roman Church, and to the superiority of the quotations from Valentinus and his school as given by Hippolytus to the ordinary rubbish put out by the average Gnostic.

The translation appears to be scholarly; and the notes are particularly illuminating. The fault is that Mr. Legge is obsessed by the feeling that at all costs he must be faithful to the original. Now the object of a translation ought to be to put into the hands of the uninstructed reader something that he can peruse with interest; and this is not possible when the idioms of another language exactly reproduced are not those of his own. If anyone wants to discover the exact meaning of the writer, he must refer to the original, and then he does not need a translation to give the precise sense. In our opinion in order to make the Fathers familiar to a public who ought to know something about them, but are not meticulous scholars, they should be translated into agreeable English, even at the cost of the translator's reputation as an expert in the language he is interpreting.

Now one of the best told stories in patristic literature is that of Callistus: and this is how Mr. Legge renders the opening remarks of Hippolytus.

"It seems good to us then to set forth the loveable life of this man since he was born at the same time as ourselves, in order that by the mode of life of such a one being made apparent, the heresy which he has taken in hand may become well and quickly known to such as have a right mind. He bore witness when Fuscianus was Prefect of Rome; and the manner of his martyrdom was on this wise.

"Callistus chanced to be a house-slave of a certain Carpophorus, a man of the faith who was of Cæsar's household. To him as one of the faith Carpophorus entrusted no little money. . . . Who taking it set up a money-changers' stall."

In his notes, Mr. Legge explains that *ἀγαπητός* is, like the word "noble," applied by Artemus Ward to the Red man, "rit sarcastik." *ἐπικεχειρημένη αἵρεσις* would mean "a heresy taken in hand" if the phrase were English, which it is *not*. *ἐμαρτύρησε* would be rightly rendered "he bore witness" if it conveyed any idea to the reader. "Who taking it" is a literal rendering of *ὃς λαβών*, but few English sentences begin thus. Now this is not translation: it is rendering Greek into "crib English."

F. J. Foakes Jackson.

The Evolution of the New Testament. By John Elliotson Symes, M.A. John Murray. 1921. 18s.

This book is both less, and more, than we anticipated from its title. But the "more" predominates. We think that "An Introduction to the Study and Contents of the New Testament" would have described it more accurately. Mr. Symes' aim is to give to ordinary readers of the New Testament an account of the order in which the books were probably written, and to weave them into their proper place in the history of the Church.

His introductory chapter, entitled "Before the New Testament," considering its brevity, gives a very comprehensive outline of Church history, before there were any Christian writings. In his order, and dating of the books, Mr. Symes will be regarded as very conservative. It is true that he gives up St. Matthew as the author of the first Gospel, except in so far as the incorporation of the *Logia* justifies the title "*according to* Matthew" (p. 247). But he practically adopts Lightfoot's scheme for the Pauline Epistles; he considers that *Luke* and *Acts* were probably written before the Fall of Jerusalem (p. 227), and the difficulties of believing that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse were written by the same person do not seem to him to be insuperable (pp. 271, 290).

Throughout, however, he shows that he is aware of, and has not ignored, the problems. He has weighed the conclusions of many critics with whom he disagrees, and, to some extent, shows the grounds of his disagreement. It is refreshing to find any critic, in these days, who is disposed to treat the traditional ascriptions with respect rather than with suspicion, and he rightly points out that there could be no ulterior motive in attributing two of the Gospels to such inconspicuous persons as Mark and Luke were, apart from the Gospels that bear their name.

He seems to combine the North Galatian and South Galatian theories (pp. 82-3), though accepting all the advantages of the latter (p. 10).

He can see no grounds for denying the ancient tradition that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, in some sense of the word "bishop" (pp. 107-8).

His little diagram on p. 209 gives us, at a glance, the relations between the Synoptists and their sources, according to what is now the common view.

His speculations on the origin of the Infancy narratives (pp. 224, 249), on the personality of "James, the Lord's brother" (pp. 181-3), and on the possible relations of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome (pp. 110, 114) are, like other people's on the same subjects, pure speculations, with more or less likelihood of being approaches to the truth. There are many *lacunæ* both in the Gospel and in the early history of the Church, and it takes

more than a genius to supply *lacunæ* with any hope of general acceptance. His explanation why there were no very early narratives of the Lord's life seems to be sound: "Christians must always have been interested in the life and sayings of the Founder of their religion. But in the twenty or thirty years after His death, there was much less of this interest than we should have expected. Believers looked forward to the speedy return of their Lord; and so far as they looked backward, they were so greatly absorbed by the closing scenes of the Incarnate Life, that they allowed the rest of the biography to remain in the background."

A postscript to the Preface tells us that "Mr. Symes died a few months before the publication of this book." We are very grateful that he was spared to finish it, and believe that it will be found a serviceable introduction to, and summary of the contents of, the New Testament.

T. W. Little.

The Cathedral: A Novel. By Hugh Walpole. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. net.

People are sure to ask Mr. Walpole what Cathedral he is describing with so much love and skill. It is in the west of England. Mr. Walpole admits it himself. Moreover, the Archdeacon's cook bewrays it when she says that the houses in the precincts will "fall on top of you as soon as whistle Trefusis." Knowing something of Mr. Walpole, and hearing much of an important benefice called Pybus, you might vote for Truro and read Probus. But you would be all astray, even though you were to point out that "our town is famous among Cathedral cities for the morality of its upper classes." The fact is that it was Henry of Arden, Bishop of Polchester, born in 1100, who founded the greatness of the Cathedral, and who so managed its affairs "that Polchester now (*sc.*, in 1897) could boast one of the richest revenues of any Cathedral in Europe"; which indeed, is not a quite elegant sentence and is a most incautious statement, when you consider that the secretary of the Ecclesiastical Commission may be, as we are, one of your regular readers. So Truro is doubly out of it.

Neither, again, is it Exeter; for Polchester's canonries are in the gift of the Crown; which, by the way, knocks the bottom out of the crucial question of who should be incumbent of Pybus—crucial to Mr. Walpole because "Heaven alone knows how many Canons and Archdeacons [of Polchester] had made their first bow there to the Glebeshire world!"; whereas the Crown is rather lacking in these local enthusiasms. At Exeter (and in most other Precincts) Canon Ronder would certainly not have been obliged to rent the house formerly occupied by the late Hon. Mrs. Pentecoste, because he would have a statutory right to his canonical residence, with an obligation to abide in it. At Exeter the Precentor is, indeed, one of the *maiores personæ*, but though they may say of the Precentor at Exeter that he can "whistle Trefusis," yet he stands apart from the Precentor of Polchester, who "sang the services beautifully" and "flushed with pleasure to the very tips of his over-large ears," when a new canon told him so. The Polchester Precentor, by the way, was called Ryle; his motto was "politeness all the way round," and he was somehow afraid lest the Archdeacon should have him dismissed. No; it cannot be Exeter. If you have any doubt about it, go to a Chapter Meeting at Polchester and hear the Dean say: "Will you sit here on my

right, Archdeacon ?" For at Exeter they all know their places in Chapter; certainly the Archdeacon does.

So it is better to cease your bootless inquisition and enjoy Mr. Walpole's story; for it is neither the geography nor the architecture of the Cathedral that matters, though the one be obscured and the other described again and again to the top of admiration. What is before you is a fine study of ὕβρις with its proper attendance of Erinyes of various kinds. The particular tyrant happens to be an ecclesiastic and to strut his little hour in a Cathedral. These are skilful accidents, like Marquis's Circus, of which Mr. Walpole gives a masterly description. The essence of it all was revealed to Nebuchadnezzar, in time to bring him to his senses; the Archdeacon was just going out of his mind when he died of a heart attack in Chapter.

ERNEST WORCESTER.

THE SWEDISH RITE: A TRANSLATION OF "HANDBOK FÖR SVENSKA KYRKAN." By Eric E. Yelverton, O.B.E., B.D. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

This is a translation of the Swedish Prayer Book, and it comes very opportunely for English readers now that so much interest has been taken in the question of Swedish Orders.

The translation is, in general, very accurate; the translator has had, naturally, to sacrifice literary merit to this accuracy, with the result that English readers may, to a certain extent, get an incorrect view. The Swedish Prayer Book, especially in its later editions, was never the same piece of magnificent Swedish prose as our Prayer Book is of English prose, but in Swedish it is not really so dreary as it strikes one in the translation. A few errors of rendering we notice: Mr. Yelverton translates Mässkend and Mässhakar alike as "chasuble," whereas vestments and chasuble would be more accurate. More important is the error of translation in the Instalment of Bishops; the translator renders "Almighty God strengthen and help thee to fulfil these promises. And according to the Commission, which is entrusted to me for this purpose on God's behalf by His Church, I commit to thee herewith the office of Bishop in the diocese of N.N. in the name of God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen." A strictly exact translation is "God Almighty strengthen and help you to keep these vows! And according to the 'fullmakt' [*i.e.*, letters patent] which is entrusted to me on God's behalf by His Congregation for this purpose, I admit thee herewith to the Bishop's office in N.N. diocese in God's, Father's and Son's and the Holy Spirit's, name. Amen." One cannot but suspect a controversial object in the first translation.

In his Introduction the translator clearly shows this object; assuming the very doubtful point that the Swedish Church carried a valid succession over from pre-Reformation days, he sets out to defend the validity of the Swedish Ordinal and Sacraments. But for this purpose it is not sufficient to give the present revised Swedish Ordinal, etc., only; one needs to know all the ordinals that have been in use in Sweden since the Reformation, and a comparison of these would lead most persons to agree that they are not able to carry on validity continuously even if the present Ordinal is valid.

Space will not allow of examining the Ordinal as fully as we should wish, but there are three preliminary matters which Mr. Yelverton does not mention: (1) The Church of Sweden has abolished the diaconate,

which does not look as if it was intended to preserve Catholic orders. (2) Formerly, on occasions when the Bishop was unable to take an ordination, the domprost (Dean) took it instead (this has been denied, but is now admitted by Swedish scholars). (3) Also, the Swedish Church admits the full validity of all Lutheran orders, episcopal or non-episcopal.

In their Ordinal there are three services:

1. How a Bishop shall be installed in his office.
2. Concerning consecration to the priest's office.
3. How a kyekoherde (literally, Church herdsman)—*i.e.*, Incumbent—shall be installed in a congregation.

All these services are precisely similar, but one would presume that the title means something.

The translator, in his Introduction, boldly insists that the word "inställas," when used for a Bishop means "consecration," when precisely the same word is used for an Incumbent he insists it means "induction." This will convince few. The fact is that either Bishops and Incumbents are alike "installed" and Priests "consecrated," or that the three orders of the Swedish Church are Bishops, Priests and Incumbents; in neither case can it be maintained that the intention is to preserve Catholic orders surely.

There is much more we should like to notice, but space forbids. If our criticism should appear very adverse we wish to add that we are fully conscious of many good points both in the Swedish Prayer Book and the Swedish Church, but both are essentially Protestant and glory in it, and when it becomes a matter of validity we confess we have little patience with special pleading of the nature of the Introduction to this work. At the same time we are fully conscious of the merits of Mr. Yelverton's translation.

[The late] W. H. Westall.

Asian Cristology and the Mahayana. By E. A. Gordon. Maruzen Co., Ltd., Tokyo. 1921.

Mrs. Gordon gives us in this book a reprint of an Indian Church History, written in 1818 by Thomas Yeates, and adds copious notes of her own with the intention of throwing light on the difficult question of the influence of Syriac Christianity on Buddhism. A careful study of the evidences which have been brought to light by historians and archæologists is certainly very much to be desired. Numberless questions occur to one's mind which need to be answered. When did Christianity first enter India? If Nestorian Christianity entered China as the Sianfu Monument testifies, how did it so mysteriously vanish? Why is it that not a single Christian Scripture has been preserved in China? Did Lii Yen (*b.* A.D. 755) receive his spiritual teaching from Christianity, and is the Chinese secret society (Chin-tan Chiao) a Nestorian body? Was Shan-tao (*d.* A.D. 681), who taught salvation by faith in Amitabha Buddha, influenced by Syrian Christians? Is Mahayana Buddhism after all Christianity in an Eastern guise? A great gap in the history of Christianity is waiting to be filled up by a scholar who has at his command a first-hand knowledge of Syriac Christianity and the Buddhist records. While on the one hand the literature is vast, the actual authorities of any value are so scanty and problematical that it needs scholarship and insight of the highest order to unravel the enigmas requiring solution.

Mrs. Gordon has certainly a host of material at her command—material

which she has gathered together principally by individual research during her many years of travel in the East. Her notes are, however, marred by a want of unity as she hurries along from one subject to another. Useless references and comparisons are often made which irritate the reader as he endeavours to get at the bed-rock of facts, and a one-sided enthusiasm for her subject, accompanied by an originality in comparative study, seriously depreciates her historical perspective. As she suddenly passes, for example, from Chin-tan Chiao to John Bunyan's* "unique pill of immortality," to be taken "fasting—three at a time—in a quarter pint of tears of Repentance," or from the Chinese clay image of Yakushi† to Yahveh, and then to the Assyrian Ia (Ea) and Egyptian Osiris, leading the reader into a host of irrelevant details such as the darkening of the sun at the Crucifixion, the comparative student feels rather unhappy. Mrs. Gordon makes comparisons of the most fanciful kind which take away one's confidence in her as a sane historian.

Evidence is also brought forward without sufficient testimony by both Mr. Yeates and Mrs. Gordon, the authenticity of which might be open to serious doubt. How far, for instance, can we put credence in the Acts of Thomas as a historical document? Professor Burkitt, who has made a study of the document, states, "that the stories told in the Acts of Thomas have little or no historical basis is indeed almost self-evident"; "the real interest of the Acts is not historical" (two lectures delivered at Trinity College, Dublin), though he considers that the Acts are good evidence for the teaching of the early Syriac Christians. In his "Early Eastern Christianity" he refers to the Easterns as good story-tellers, and introduces his study of the Acts of Thomas by writing: "We shall not be surprised to find that the most striking and original piece of Syriac literature is a novel."

It is difficult to get a clear idea of Mrs. Gordon's objective from the book in question, but her apparent desire to equate Christianity and Buddhism is surely a hopeless task, and the confusion of Buddhist saints with adherents of Christianity (*e.g.*, Buddho Simha on p. 163) without a careful study of the historical facts is fatal. It might be urged that Christianity has influenced Mahayana Buddhism, but to treat the three notes of the Saddharma Pundarika (Light, Life, and Love) as "identical" with those of St. John's writings is to mistake a religion steeped in metaphysics and possessing in its ultimate form an impersonal idea of reality, with a religion which proclaims Fatherhood as the essential characteristic of God, Who cannot be thought of in any other way than as personal. All the northern Buddhist sects in the end lead up to an impersonal idea of God, whether it be the virtual atheism of the Rinzai, Solo, and Obaku sects, the pantheism of the Tendai and Shingon, or the theism of the Amida sects. The latter, which approach nearest to a personal idea of God, and may very likely, through Shan-tao, have been influenced by Syriac Christianity, in the end give us the Buddha-principle (the Absolute Bhutata thata) as manifested on the ideal plane (Sambho gakaya) where an Unknowable and impersonal Absolute can be spoken of as personal. On the other hand, the Christian idea of God cannot be thought of otherwise than as personal in its ultimate form, though that personality must be thought of as perfect in contrast to the limitations of human personality.

Unfortunately Mrs. Gordon's book contains a vast number of uncorrected printer's errors. Not only have different founts of type been

* P. 212. † P. 188.

mixed up, but incorrect spelling frequently occurs. Without any scrupulous search for errors we have noticed at least sixty. For example, on p. 78, a "v" occurs in "church," a "h" in "distributes," and a "l" in "Christian." Why is Christology in the title spelt without a "h"?

F. Harold Smith.

The Life of Otto, Apostle of Pomerania, 1060-1139. By Ebo and Herbordus. Translated by Charles H. Robinson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 1920. Pp. 193. 8s. 6d. net.

Although one of the most striking pages in the history of the conversion of Europe, the story of Otto has never been translated or fully told in English before. Elected Bishop of Bamberg in 1102, Otto spent the following three years, before his consecration, in making himself familiar with conditions in his diocese, but it was not until after 1121 that he undertook his first missionary tour. His methods certainly had their defects: he did not know the native language, made no vernacular translation of the Bible, trained no native clergy, was lax in insisting upon the necessity of adequate instruction before Baptism (at Lyritz he baptized 7,000 converts after only twenty days' preparation); but his personal qualities, unflinching courage, deep humility, and strong faith, made for striking success, and secured for him the affection of his fellow-labourers and the admiration of the fierce people he had gone out to evangelize. Within a few years of his death, at least three Lives of him were composed—by Ebo, by Herbordus, and by a monk of the Prüfling monastery—written, as is now most generally held, in this order: Ebo's about 1151, Herbordus' in 1158, and the third some years later. Robinson adds to his already well-known work on this period of missionary enterprise by here translating Ebo's second and third books, which deal with Otto's labours in Pomerania, supplementing them by information peculiar to Herbordus and occasionally from the third Life. The story makes a fascinating one for its own sake, and is not without its value as a study in missionary method. The book is one well worth reading, and can be confidently recommended as a living record of a splendid life spent in unwearied Christian service, and that, too, in a period which is too little known. There is a useful Bibliography and a good Index, completing a volume which has a decided value for both head and heart.

J. H. Baxter.

Studies in Soul Training. By F. J. B. Allnatt, D.D. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

This is the work, published after his death, of one who was a greatly respected teacher in the Canadian Church. Those who turn to it expecting any great novelties of subject-matter, or special attractions of style, will not find what they want. But perhaps the wiser of us will be rather encouraged than deterred by the absence of such characteristics in a book of this kind. We hear so much of the need of new methods in religion that we are thankful to be reminded of what was good and effective in the old; and, when the realities of spiritual experience are to be dealt with, it is a comfort to have them presented in a plain and masculine manner, without any attempts at rhetoric or a too evident facility of expression.

If we cannot say that Dr. Allnatt is exactly a modern George Herbert, we can commend his book as full of wise counsels and as revealing a

shrewd insight into the present conditions of pastoral work. The standard is high. "Two hours per day" is suggested as the time to be given to the priest's systematic private devotion. He is told that "to make prayer a real act of force for the benefit of any individual, it would seem that the whole prayer should be offered for him separately." Much that is practically valuable is said about the difficult matter of Meditation, the main point being the importance of preserving a "consciousness of the presence of Him Whom you are addressing, as well as the attitude of attention, as expecting, looking for, a response from Him, to be borne in upon your mind in the form of luminous or elevating thoughts."

Wise and sensible advice is offered as to fasting; and much that is clearly the result of long experience is urged in regard to the hearing of confessions and the visitation of the sick. Things that are worth pondering are said under the latter head, about Sacramental anointing, the length of the visit, the relation to the doctor, and a reasonable, but not over-anxious, avoiding of infection.

We hope that a circulation will be secured for the book, and we should be glad to think that it would become known to the teachers of those who are preparing for Holy Orders. Indeed, there are none of us who might not be the better for sitting at the feet of an author who could convince us that "there is nothing so contagious as real earnestness, unless it be real indifference."

A. W. Robinson.

BOOK NOTES

The Contents of the New Testament. By Haven McClure. Macmillan. 7s.

The chief interest of this book, written by the Secretary of the Indiana State Teachers' Association, is the way it reflects present religious tendencies in the United States. The author is clearly a devout worshipper in some religious denomination, and his book is accepted by a leading publisher, yet on nearly every page he offends against accuracy or good taste. Here are a few examples of inaccuracies: The Greek Church rejects the Apocalypse; nowhere does the New Testament suggest that Joseph was not the literal father of Jesus; "there is no concept of 'serving' or 'service' in the Fourth Gospel." These solecisms as regards reverence and good taste may be quoted: Jesus was "a horny-handed workman" and "every inch a man"; Mary was "an attractive woman"; the early Church called Mark "old stub-finger." The writer's spiritual perception may be gauged from his recommendation to eliminate the supernatural from prayer, and his concession that there is nothing in the religion of Jesus barring His angelology and demonology that conflicts with sanity and common sense. Notwithstanding these faults the book has merits, and a reader who knows how to reject the evil and choose the good will find in it some valuable hints as to the presentment of a technical subject in a clear and attractive manner.

The Meaning of the Cross. A Study of the Atonement. By Edward Grubb. Allen and Unwin. Pp. 157. 5s.

A straightforward and non-technical book, which ought to prove very useful to the average reader. The sacrificial teaching of the Old Testament is discussed, and the various presentations of the meaning of the death of Christ in the Gospels and Epistles. In contradistinction

to Dr. Rashdall the writer holds that "the Servant prophecy was in the mind of Jesus." A brief but lucid account of early and medieval theories follows, and then a full discussion of the doctrine of Substitution, its history, and the difficulties it presents to present-day thought. Some modern theories are also discussed, and though both objective and subjective ideas are found wanting as they stand at present, the conviction is expressed that a true doctrine will presently be stated, and some of the conditions which it must fulfil are laid down. Possibly it is Mr. Grubb's Quaker predilections which make him inclined to see hints of "magical efficacy" implied in anything ceremonial, so that he can see no real significance, typical or otherwise, in the Old Testament sacrificial system; possibly, also, he does not, in speaking of the Old Testament teaching of repentance in connection with sacrifice and that of the Gospels on sacrifice, make enough allowance for what was so much the background of common thought that it might be taken for granted. One important point is fully recognized; the reality and seriousness of sin has to be taken into account. It is "a terrible reality and a hideous and loathsome thing." Dr. Rashdall, as Mr. Grubb says, does not see the inherent difficulty of a change of mind and heart. The central place in any theory that is to be acceptable must be given to the Cross. "What man tried to do with his sacrifices, God Himself has done." The Cross was at once the gift of God and the surrender of man.

Tom Bryan : First Warden of Fircroft. By H. G. Wood and A. E. Ball. Pp. 156. 5s.

God in the Old Testament. By R. A. Aytoun. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

The chief interest in these books, both of them memorials to notable educationists who have recently died, is the light they throw on the energetic work done by the Society of Friends and their sympathizers in the field of adult education. A group of educational institutions in the suburbs of Birmingham is engaged in activities which have no parallel in the Church of England. Woodbrooke, the best known, takes in hand the training of laymen from eighteen to eighty. Fircroft is indeed remarkable. It is modelled on the Danish High Schools, and takes young working men for a resident course devised on humanistic not vocational lines. Mr. Bryan with all his University culture remained a genuine working man, and successfully resisted the inevitable tendency of Fircroft to approximate to middle-class ideals of living. The book deserves close study by those who are, or feel they ought to be, interested in adult education. Mr. Aytoun's lectures are able, but not out of the ordinary. But the prefixed biography is charming.

Regeneration and Reconstruction. By S. B. John. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

This little book contains a number of obvious remarks, vigorously and persuasively expressed. It can do nothing but good if people will read it; but an intelligent student of public affairs will not find that it adds anything to his knowledge. It is marred by an excessive use of quotation and by the exaggeration common among preachers. When an author says that selfishness has never been so strongly organized as to-day since the days of the Roman Empire, one concludes that he has no first-hand knowledge of history.

English Mystics. By Geraldine E. Hodgson. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Hodgson has written a scholarly popularization of English Mysticism from early Saxon days to the present time, which will do for a different class of reader what Dean Inge did in his famous lectures. The book is specially intended for Anglo-Catholic readers, and does not profess to be objective in its treatment. Sir Thomas Browne, Henry Vaughan, John Donne, and others have a chapter to themselves as "Anglo-Catholic Mystics." But if a modern name is to be applied to the seventeenth century, why should we stop there? Why not boldly call Richard Rolle an Anglo-Catholic? The writer's conclusion is that "some element at least of mystical experience and practice should be the lot of every lover of God." The book can be recommended as a companion volume to Bishop Chandler's *First-Hand Religion.*

Modernism in Religion. By J. M. Sterrett. Macmillan. 6s.

One reads American books of this class with a desire to recommend them if possible. It is most important that English readers should keep in touch with the vigorous Christianity of the United States. But time after time one is disappointed. The author of this book summarizes the past achievements and present position of the Modernist movement, and advocates a Modernist union of the like-minded in all Churches. He assures his readers that he is incurably religious and Christian, and his heart is obviously in the right place. But English readers will not derive much sustenance from his book.

The Mystery of Jesus. By Dom Savinien Louismet, O.S.B. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 5s. 6d.

When a "religious" writes a book of devotional meditations on the life of Jesus, one of a series which has had a great vogue and has helped many pilgrims homeward, the voice of criticism should, if possible, be hushed. Anglicans to whom Latin as distinct from Anglo-Saxon piety is congenial will value this book. But many will be repelled by its pious opinions and imaginative flights. Few Englishmen could make their own the meditation in which the writer imagines himself an old shoe, which the child Jesus ties to a string and trails through the dust. That the Passion of Our Lord is mystically continued to-day is a familiar thought. But that the Modernists are the Judases of to-day is an unwelcome application of it. Compared with them "Judas was almost a gentleman." Whatever our judgment on the papal claims, the Bishop of Rome is recognized as occupying a position of unique honour. So a sentence such as the following has an unreal ring: "For the last half-century, Christ, in the person of His Vicar upon earth, has been a prisoner in the Vatican, an object of mockery and insult to the rabble of the world."

The Return of Christendom. By A Group of Churchmen. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The contributors to this volume include M. B. Reckitt, H. H. Slesser, L. S. Thornton, A. J. Carlyle, A. J. Penty, and Paul Bull; Bishop Gore writes a Preface and G. K. Chesterton an Epilogue. The theme is the need of a new social order. Industrialism has broken down, and a Catholic Sociology founded on medieval theory is the only hope for the future. Marxism and the class-war are as much discredited as the Capitalist system, which is ultimately based on the Reformation. The writers have great

gifts of exposition and persuasion, but many readers will remain unconvinced. The book implies Guild-Socialism as the remedy, but so new a theory cannot command much confidence. The antithesis between Catholic and Protestant economics is common to-day, but it is being pressed for more than it is worth. Those who lived under the medieval system, Catholics and Protestants alike, gladly burst their fetters in the sixteenth century. That Protestant England took the lead in the industrial revolution was due to earlier exploitation of its coalfields rather than to its religious theory. Is there any difference to-day between Catholic Belgium and Protestant Holland as regards their attitude towards industrial problems? The book deserves to be widely read in Anglo-Catholic circles, where "Christian Social" interests have suffered an eclipse of recent years.

St. Luke. By Lonsdale Ragg. Methuen. 15s.

Any new volume of the *Westminster Commentaries* is sure of a welcome; a commentary of the first part of St. Luke's composite work, the second part of which was so admirably treated by Mr. Rackham, awakens great expectations. That these are not entirely fulfilled by the present volume is partly due to the difficulty of the task. A commentator on the Synoptic Gospels must do two things and may do three, or even four. (1) He must explain the exact shade of meaning intended by the writer and apprehended by the first readers; (2) he must compare the account given by his author with that found in the two parallel narratives, and give reasons for preferring one of the three as the most accurate representation of what was actually said and done; (3) he may apply the lessons of the narrative to the circumstances of his readers; and (4) he may produce illustrations from Church history, and thus make his book a companion to Prothero's *Psalms in Human Life.* The present book is remarkable for the success with which it accomplishes (4): the illustrations from Dante and Italian art are a delightful and original feature; (3) is attempted sparingly. Where the author seems to fail is in his insufficient discrimination between processes (1) and (2). In this respect he fails to show the acceptance of critical principles claimed as a feature of the series. In a commentary of this size the reader can fairly expect to find the evidence given with some fulness on both sides in disputed passages. Loyalty to the Catholic faith does not exclude but rather demands the utmost candour and avoidance of over-statement.

Three instances may be given out of a number noticed to illustrate the foregoing criticisms.

In v. 19, where men are said to let down the patient "through the tiles," St. Luke substitutes this phrase for St. Mark's digging through the mud roofing. The roof was either tiles or mud, not both. Clearly St. Luke makes the incident more intelligible to his readers by altering the structure of the house to what was familiar to them. Mr. Ragg's comment gives the impression that he is trying to harmonize the two accounts in a manner once common, but now given up: "They removed, perhaps, some overhanging verandah roofing, and lowered the pallet by ropes into the courtyard. Mark ii. 5 says they "dug through" the (mud) roofing.

A note on xi. 51, "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah," which explains Zachariah by a reference to 2 Chron. xxiv., and does not

mention the alternative explanation suggested by the parallel passage in the First Gospel, is surely insufficient in a commentary of this size. And what is the reader to make of a note on xiii. 11, the woman with "a spirit of infirmity"? "It is quite in accordance with modern thought to attribute such a malady to malign influences, and to effect its cure by a laying on of hands." "Certain modern writers" is all that can fairly be said.

But these are details. In the main the commentary is fresh, interesting and trustworthy, and deserves to be widely read. It will probably be far more useful to the clergy and general reader than Dr. Plummer's volume in the *International Critical Commentary*.

The Dream Mother. By Theresa Hicks Bolton. Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

A delicately written and charming novel with a religious purpose. Joan Dorey, daughter of an Oxford don and a Spanish dancer, is left an orphan in infancy, and is adopted by an Anglican priest who boards her with two sisters working in the parish. Her school days and early womanhood are described with insight. After a period of agnosticism she passes to the Roman Communion by a kind of inevitable process. Those who liked Fr. Hugh Benson's novel with a purpose will enjoy this, which is very good of its kind. The High Anglicans in the book are treated most sympathetically, the S.C.M. (under a thin alias) rather maliciously.

Devotional Thoughts on the Psalms. By B. W. Randolph. Mowbray. 3s.

These devout reflections will be helpful to simple folk, and the clergy may safely recommend them. They make no pretence to scholarship, as this note on "Kiss the Son" shows: "We are to render our lowly homage to the Son of God"; and there is no attempt to probe the deeper mystical meanings.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

INDEX OF VOLUME V

JULY—DECEMBER, 1922

PAGES

APOSTOLIC Gnosis, The 51
Aramaic Origin of Fourth Gospel 47
Australia and Reunion 280
BARKER, E., History and Religion 17
Barlow Once More 269
BATE, H. N., Critical Work of J. Weiss 216, 262
BULL, H. P. 175
Bunyan, A Study of 65
BURKITT, F. C., Review of: Aramaic Origin of Fourth Gospel, Burney . . 47
CARPENTER-GARNIER, M. R., Prayer 182
Catholic Church, The 138
Catholicism in Germany 257
Christ and Society 190
CLARKE, C. P. S., Maintenance of Clergy in Early Church 75
Confessions, Hearing of 147, 152
Conversion 175
COOKE, G. A., Reviews of: Job, Ball, Devine 238
Creeds or No Creeds 99, 236
Doctrine of Sacrifice in Indian Religious Literature, The 320
Early Chapters of Genesis, The 297
English "Congregation of Rites," An 329
Eucharistic Sacrifice, The 170
EVANS, T. VARTEG, An English "Congregation of Rites" 329
FOAKES JACKSON, F. J., Review of: Proof of the Gospel, Ferrar . . . 102
Review of: Hippolytus, Philosophumena 340
GLUBOKOVSKY, N., Russian Church under Bolsheviks 224
God as Psychological Reality 316
Gospel and Creed 110
Harmonism and Conscious Evolution 288
History and Religion 17
HOCKLEY, G. W., Hearing Confessions 147
HOLMES, W. H. G., The Doctrine of Sacrifice in India 320
HOSKYNS, E. C., Catholicism in Germany 257
Human Nature and the Fall—A Note 304
Immortality of the Unseen World 55
Job 238
LACEY, T. A., Barlow Once More 269
Human Nature and the Fall—A Note 304
LANGFORD-JAMES, Reviews of: Modern Gnostic Books 245
LAWSON, N. G., The Early Chapters of Genesis 297
LEBRETON, J., Dr. Relton's Christology 205
LITTLE, T. W., Review of Evolution of N.T. 342
LOCKTON, W., Martyrdom of St. John 80
LOWTHER CLARKE, H., Review of: Apostolic Gnosis, Lea and Bond . . 51
LOWTHER CLARKE, W. K., Studies in Texts 37, 97, 284, 335
Maintenance of the Clergy in Early Church 75
Martyrdom of St. John 80
MATTHEWS, H. J. C., Spiritualism 6

PAGES

Moore, M., Plato and More 89
Moulsdale, S. R. P., Eucharistic Sacrifice 170
Mozley, Person of Our Lord 130
Notices of Books 57, 104, 195, 245, 291, 339
Old Testament, Some Books on 286
Percival, Life of Bishop 105
Permanent Elements in Protestant Theology 25
Person of Our Lord 130
Plato and Sir P. More 89
Prayer 182
Proof of the Gospel 102
Rawlinson, G. C., Hearing Confessions 152
Relton's Christology 205
Relton, H. M., Review of: Harmonism and Conscious Evolution, Walston . . 288
Ripon, Bishop of, Gospel and Creed 110
Robinson, P. H., Review of: Immortality and Unseen World, Oesterley . . 55
Russian Church under Bolsheviks 224
Sacraments of the Church 164
Sacramental Religion 157
St. Stephen's Place in Christian Origins 306
Selwyn, E. G., Study of John Bunyan 65
The Supernatural 119
St. Stephen's Place in Christian Origins 306
Shebbeare, C. J., Permanent Elements in Protestant Theology . . . 25
Slesser, H. H., Christ and Society 190
Somervell, D. C., Sub Obtentu Religionis 83
Sparrow Simpson, W. J., Sacraments of the Church 164
Spiritualism 6
Stockley, J. J. C., The Catholic Church 138
Studies in Texts 37, 97, 284
Sub Obtentu Religionis 83
Supernatural, The 119
Swedish Bishops' Reply to Lambeth 39
Taylor, A. E., Review of: Creeds or No Creeds, Harris 99
Thornton, L. S., Sacramental Religion 157
Thouless, R. H., God as Psychological Reality 316
Weiss' Critical Work 216, 262
Worcester, Bishop of, Review of The Cathedral 343

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.